



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE  
Modern Language Association of America  
1906.

---

VOL. XXI, 3.

NEW SERIES, VOL. XIV, 3.

---

XII.—PARATAXIS IN PROVENÇAL.

Comparative philologists have long since recognized that the logical relation of mental concepts need not find expression by means of words. Viewed from the standpoint of pure logic a sentence like "I think he will come" contains a subordination; but the student of historical grammar rightly regards it as exhibiting two independent, if not unrelated, sentences. It is altogether likely that such a method of juxtaposing concepts was the only one that prevailed in remote antiquity and that in the course of time such a loosely connected sequence of clauses developed into one organic whole. The fact of parataxis is now established for all branches of the Indo-European family, and Hermann<sup>1</sup> has proved that grammatical subordination was unknown in the "Ursprache," being developed in the daughter tongues by means of the specific determinants of the originally independent sentence. Notwithstanding these results, there is still a plentiful lack of agreement among scholars in regard

<sup>1</sup> Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, xxxiii, 481-535.

to the definition of the term parataxis and to the degree of extension to be ascribed to it.

The best recent discussion of the question is that by Morris in his important work on *Methods in Syntax*.<sup>1</sup> He demonstrates that psychologically there is no such thing as complete independence among successive groups of concepts. Contiguous sentences, to the normal mind, imply relationship; and its non-existence is an indication of mental disorder. It seems, then, advisable to avoid psychological definition of the speech-structure in question and to consider it solely as a phenomenon of language, to be defined by its linguistic characteristics. For practical purposes in the following paper, I adopt Morris' definition:<sup>2</sup> parataxis is any form of sentence structure in which two finite verbs are brought into close connection without a subordinating word to define their relation.

The various forms of the paratactic sentence have been much studied of late, especially in the Classical and Teutonic languages.<sup>3</sup> Its existence in the Romance dialects has also long been recognized. Diez<sup>4</sup> pointed out that in certain cases the conjunction *que* or the relative pronoun can be dropped. The theory of ellipsis as an explanation of parataxis is now practically obsolete. In regard to the Romance languages especially, Gröber<sup>5</sup> showed that Diez's explanation

<sup>1</sup> *Principles and Methods in Latin Syntax*, New York, 1901, chap. vi, pp. 113-149.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 146.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. especially Morris, *The Independent Subjunctive in Plautus*, *Amer. Journ. of Phil.*, xviii, 133-167, 275-301, 383-401; Becker, *Beiordnende und unterordnende Satzverbindung bei den altrömischen Bühnendichtern*, Metz, 1888; Hentze, *Die Parataxis bei Homer*, Göttingen, 1888-91; Behagel, *Germania*, xxiv, 167 ff.; Delbrück, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*, iii, 416-423.

<sup>4</sup> *Grammatik*, 1012, 1040, 1042, 1057.

<sup>5</sup> *Grundriss*<sup>1</sup>, i, 226.

is untenable and proved that in the older stages of the various dialects the logical relation of two contiguous sentences was often left to the hearer to determine, and that the new conjunctions arise out of the adverbial modifiers of an independent sentence. The only complete study of parataxis in a single Romance dialect that we possess is that of Dubislav.<sup>1</sup> The classification adopted in this paper is purely functional; the author arranges the different categories of paratactic sentence-structure in accordance with the grammatical function which one or the other of the sentences would have if subordinate. Dubislav's conclusions were accepted and extended to the other Romance languages by Meyer-Lübke,<sup>2</sup> whose classification is that of the earlier author. The disadvantages of this method are obvious and have been pointed out by Morris. Classification by grammatical function is uncertain even in the case of strictly subordinate clauses; in parataxis, where the relation is only suggested, not expressed, it becomes still more difficult. Take a case in Provençal like *Non sai hom tan sia e dieu frems . . . cum sia vas cella de cui can* (Dan. 14, 25). Is the second sentence here "objective," depending on *sai*, or "adjectival," modifying *hom*? Or in *Tals la cug' en baisan tener non a mas l'ufana* (Ba. Ch. 5220) does the second sentence correspond to a consecutive or a relative clause? In view of the uncertainty in these and similar cases, I believe it advisable to give up the older classification by apparent functional relation and to adopt one which seems more in accord with the observed facts and more apt to elucidate speech development. I shall follow, therefore, Professor Morris, who arranges the paratactic material in Latin according to the means used to indicate relation and the forms of sentence

<sup>1</sup> *Satzbeordnung für Satzunterordnung im Altfranzösischen*, Berlin, 1888.

<sup>2</sup> *Grammatik*, III, §§ 535-541.

resulting therefrom. According to him, a relation between concepts, apart from subordinating conjunctions and pronouns, may be indicated: *a*, by mere contiguity; *b*, by means of single words, adverbs, pronouns, etc.; *c*, by contrast; *d*, by word-order; *e*, by a defining parenthesis. Of course, these different methods are never kept entirely separate and distinct; two or more are often combined. It should be premised also that in Provençal word-order is practically never employed to indicate relation by itself alone, but only in combination with some other method. The foregoing scheme must be regarded, therefore, as only approximate; I arrange each example according to what seems to me its prevailing characteristic and according to the usual tendencies of the language.

The purpose of the following pages is to present a view of the different types of paratactic sentence structure in Old Provençal, arranged according to the foregoing method. Examples are taken only from trustworthy critical texts. Latin forms have been cited for comparison only when there seems to exist a genuinely genetic relation between Latin and Provençal types. These Latin examples are mostly taken from the already cited paper of Professor Morris. To show the persistency of the type in Late Latin, I give also some instances from Gregory of Tours.<sup>1</sup> And to show further the extension of the typical forms in Romance, I cite for comparison a few examples from early Italian authors. These are taken from the lyric poets in Monaci's *Crestomazia*,<sup>2</sup> from Fra Guittone d'Arezzo,<sup>3</sup> Dante,<sup>4</sup> and Dino Compagni.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Taken from Bonnet, *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours*, Paris, 1890.

<sup>2</sup> Monaci, *Crestomazia italiana dei primi secoli*, Città del Castello, 1889-97.

<sup>3</sup> Edition Pellegrini, Bologna, 1901.

<sup>4</sup> Oxford edition.

<sup>5</sup> Del Lungo, "Edizione scolastica," Florence, 1902.

## I. PARATAXIS BY CONTIGUITY.

The simplest way of denoting relation arises when two sentences, each containing a common concept, are juxtaposed without any other method being employed to indicate the connection between them. The spoken language often hints at relation more or less strongly by means of tone or stress, but such means do not ordinarily find expression in written speech. Personal pronouns sometimes assist in carrying the thought forward. When in more developed stages of language such a relation comes to be expressed in words, it is generally by the use of a coördinating conjunction or a relative pronoun. The latter means is mostly preferred to-day, and that is why I have ventured to introduce such sentences as the following into this discussion: they may be interpreted as exhibiting either subordinating parataxis or asyndetic coördination. They all show a juxtaposition of two verbs, united by a common noun concept: Crois. 1800, *E lo coms de Cumenge, segon mon eseiënt, I perdec a l'estorn un cavaer valent*, R. at de Castelbo: *plaints fo de mainta gent*; Barra 4688, *E pres at si X companhos: Trestug eran filh de baros*; In. Par. 122, 7, *En un debes prop d'un cortil Trobey pastor' ab cors ysnel: Vestida fon d'un nier sardil Ab capa grizeta ses pel*; S. Fe 133, *Vell vos vengud inz en Agen. Aqo fo hom: non ag bon sen: Tals obras va per tot fazen, Per que sabem qe Deu offen*; cf. also Denkm. 275, 90; Ap. Ch. 110, 95; Ba. Ch. 17, 29; 340, 9; 366, 35; Sord. 23, 25; Gav. 5, 8.<sup>1</sup> How easily such juxtaposition may become coördination by conjunctions is shown by

<sup>1</sup> Cf. for Italian, Guit. Sonnet 117, 4, *Il tuo affare m'è tanto amoroso Ch'ogni preghero fai prendo in comando*; Dino, I, 21, *Con lui era uno figliuolo d'uno affinatore d'ariento, si chiamava il Nero Cambi*; and for Old French, Dubislav, 5, 6; and Tobler, VB, III, 66.

two neighboring passages in *Girartz de Rossillon*, Ap. Ch. 1, 31, *La mollers Girart ac une enviouse, De sa cambre s'ancele, ville diose : Pres les claus de la porte, la cobeitose, E det les au porter, cui fun espose*, and *ibid*, 1, 24, *Lainç ac un porter maleureu, Faus crestian felun plus d'un iudeu, E gardet l'une porte en lat' en feu*. In both instances a modern writer would prefer a relational connection.

Such juxtapositions must have been common in popular Aryan speech at all epochs. They are frequently preserved in modern ballad poetry of all nations. Compare, for example, the French ballad of *La Courte Paille*:<sup>1</sup> *Le maître qu'a parti les pailles, la plus courte lui a resté. S'est écrié : O Vierge Marie ! sera donc moi : sera mangé*, with the Spanish *Conde Alarcos*:<sup>2</sup> *Porque en todos los mis reinos Vuestro pro igual no había, Sino era el conde Alarcos : Hijos y mujer tenía*, and the Scottish *Lady Maisry*:<sup>3</sup> *O out it spake a bonny boy : Stood by her brother's side*.

Occasionally a personal or demonstrative pronoun repeats the concept previously expressed, thus forming a closer union between the two verbs: Ap. Ch. 1, 457, *Trobet mei orfenine, pauche bergere, E me prest a muller : deus lo li mere*; Ba. Ch. 21, 38, *C'aisso sui remazutz Sai senes totz ajutz Per vos, e n'ai perdutz Mains dons : qui voillals prenda*. In both these cases we find a "wish" subjunctive attached paratactically to a preceding sentence and containing a pronoun which carries forward the thought. Another type is found in phrases like Biog. 20, *Et vescoms de Segur, so fo lo vescoms de Lemoges*; *ibid*, 21, 59, etc. Here we have an explanatory addition to the preceding sentence tacked on by means of a demonstrative, thus repeating what was probably the first stage in the evolution of the relative pronouns.

<sup>1</sup> Doncieux, *Romancéro populaire de la France*, xvii, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Wolf und Hoffmann, *Primavera y Flor de Romances*, II, 112.

<sup>3</sup> Child, No. 65, A, 19.

Sometimes such contiguous sentences express a locative or temporal relation, as for example: Ap. Ch. 1, 251, *Girarz iac en l'arvol: n'i a servent Fors sa muller quil sert molt bonament*; Ba. Ch. 21, 38 (Boëce), *Car la lissos es de vertat: Non hy a mot de falsetat*; Crois. 92, *El preguec Domni Deu, vezent tota la jant, Qu'el perdo sos pecatz a cel felo serjant, Cant el fo comenjat, en la ves lo gal cant.*<sup>1</sup> In such cases the thought is carried forward by adverbs, *i*, *en la ves*.

In the preceding examples, the relation of the second sentence is mostly attributive to some element of the first; the old ellipsis theory would supply a relative. In other cases the relation may be one of cause or result. So in Ap. Ch. 1, 498, *Girartz respondet: bens es que diz, E eu lai m'en irai: toz sui garniz*, the last sentence is purely causal. In the following we find a consecutive clause merely juxtaposed, without the relation being indicated grammatically in any way: Ba. Ch. 23, 20, *Quant an auzida la raso E conogro que vencut so, D'ira lor enflan li polmo: Las dens croissen cuma leo*; Crois. 2115, *Per l'escut le feri, trauquet li los brazos El perpunh e l'ausbere, que dareir pels arsos Li mes uns trotz de l'asta: sancnens fo lo penos*; *ibid*, 3072, *Qui fug sa, qui fug la: us no s'es defendutz*.

More frequently a subjunctive wish-sentence is juxtaposed in a similar manner to express a desired result, just as if *tan* or *tal* had been inserted in the preceding sentence: In. It. 19, 390, *Talanç de domna gais Met son cor en pantaïs De tota ren a faire, De son preç sia maire*; *ibid*, 21, 467, *Gardaz vostre garnir: non puosca hom mal dir*; Ap. Ch. 104, 14, *Sest mal c'an fach perdona lor: Non aion pena ni dolor*; Ba. Ch. 23, 25, *Ar escoutatz: nous sia greu, Que sus lo cel*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. in Italian, Dino, I, 2, *E ordinorono ucciderlo il dî menasse la donna; e così feciono*.



*ubert vei eu; ibid, 279, 29, Sejaç me defenderis: L'anemic non aja part En me per negun esguart.*<sup>1</sup> The last four examples are uncertain in so far as they can also be explained as mere asyndetic coördination of wishes. It seems to me, however, that in each case a vague idea of result is present in the mind of the speaker, such as would ordinarily find expression by means of *tal . . . que, tan . . . que*, or a similar subordination.

## II. PARATAXIS BY SINGLE WORDS.

In rapid narration it often happens that two actions of which one is the result of the other, are mentioned in succession, without the speaker explicitly stating that the second is a consequence of the first, as in "I ran fast: I fell." If the speaker desires to impress this result-concept upon the hearer's mind, an adverb of degree may be inserted in the first sentence, and this adverb points forward to the action of the second sentence so vividly that a relation of sequence necessarily arises: "I ran so fast: I fell." If the order of the two sentences be inverted, as in "I fell: I ran so fast," the second sentence assumes a causal relation to the action expressed in the first. In neither case does colloquial English demand a grammatical expression of this two-fold relation, although "that" or "because" may be inserted in slower speech. This type of parataxis, by means of adverbs which point forward or back, is richly represented in Provençal, giving rise to many kinds of consecutive or causal clauses. In Latin authors, this type is not frequent, though somewhat similar examples do occur, as for example

<sup>1</sup> Cf. in Italian, Dino, I, 4, *E chiamoronsi Priori delle Arti, e stettono nella torre di Castagna appresso alla Badia acciò non temessono le minacce de' potenti.* For Old French, Dubislav, 10, 11.

Plautus, Poen. 909, *ita dei faxint: ne apud lenonem hunc serviem*; Terence, Heaut. 783, *ita tu istaec miscete: ne me admisceas*; Cicero, ad Att. XIII, 21, 5, *tantum aberat ut bino (libros) scriberent: vix singulos confecerent*. The Romance languages show, however, that this type must have been abundant in popular speech.<sup>1</sup>

The adverbs or indefinite adjectives used to indicate this kind of relation in Provençal are those derived from *tantus*, *sic*, *talis* and their compounds. I consider first those sentences which have the indicative in both parts. So far as the concept-relation is concerned, it is unimportant whether the pointing particle be adjective or adverb in function. More worthy of notice is the fact that a further indication of relation is often introduced by means of the word-order, the particle being placed at the head of the sentence. The examples fall then into the following groups:

1. Paratactic consecutive clauses with *tan*.

A. With *tan* in the interior of the sentence: C. M. 5, 21, *Qand eu vas mi donz vir l'esgar Li sieu beill huoill tant ben l'estan: Per paura mi teing car eu vas lieis mon cor*; Ap. Ch. 6, 118, *E porto un' ascona tan fera e tan estranha: Ja res no la vira quel bratz destre nos franha*; *ibid*, 105, 42; 105, 162; 105, 229; Born 11, 51, *Mas eu hai tant ensenhador: Non sai, per Crist, lo mielhs chausir*; *ibid*, 28, 31; Dan. 11, 40, *Per qu'ieu sui d'est prec tant espertz: Non ai d'als talen neis magre*; Crois. 3510, *E en tantas maneiras s'en es fort entremes: Non es dreitz ni razos c'om ara loilh tolques*; *ibid*, 4283, 7065, 7248, 8303; Flam. 4012, *Perdutz fos qui bendas fes primas, Quar hom non las poc far tan primas: La vista d'ome non afollen*; Monk 2, 31; Rom. 2, 3; 2, 20; Gav. 2, 21; 7, 42; 7, 56, etc.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Meyer-Lübke, § 538; and for Old French, Dubislav, 12 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For Italian, cf. Monaci, 35, 2, 22, *Di tanto bello sete: Non è donna ki sia all' a sì bella pare*; Dino, II, 20, *Il padre loro gli disse che . . . gli darebbe tante delle sue terre sarebbe sodisfatto*.

B. With *tan* at head of sentence : Ba. Ch. 62, 21, *Tant ai mon cor plen de joja : Tot me desnatura* ; *ibid*, 94, 25 ; 214, 16 ; Ap. Ch. 96, 45 ; Blac. 1, 28, *Tant m'es avinen Qand ab midons cui ador Puosc jazer sotz cubertor : Ren als no m'es tant plazen* ; Born 6, 60, *Tant etz falhit el rei e en sa mort : Laig razonar fai en cort vostre tort* ; *ibid*, 37, 3 ; Dan. 3, 52 ; 9, 22 ; Crois. 1802, 4218 ; Monk 15, 18 ; Sord. 40, 125 ; Flam. 1711, 6960 ; In. Par. 26, 41 ; Dicht. iv, 2 ; Capd. 17, 43 ; Gav. 2, 26 ; Denkm. 211, 20, etc.

When the order of the two sentences is inverted, the concept first in point of time being placed last to indicate the cause, the word-order is invariable, *tan* always heading the sentence. The only exception that I have noted appears in Mont. 2, 50, *E ieu, las, a cui mas platz Mueir, quan vei vostre cors gens : D'enveia tan mi destrenh*. This type of parataxis is extraordinarily frequent in Provençal, and is still in common use in the modern Romance dialects, save Roumanian.<sup>1</sup> I cite only a few examples : Born 8, 4, *Bem platz car trega ni fis Non reman entrels baros, Qu'ades plantavon boissos : Tant aman ortz e jardis* ; Dan. 15, 7, *Ades ses lieis dic a lieis cochos motz, Pois quan la vei non sai : Tant l'ai que dire* ; cf. also Ba. Ch. 29, 22 ; 31, 5 ; 34, 3 ; 60, 30 ; Mont. 1, 20 ; 6, 5 ; Crois. 249, 2699, 4945 ; Monk 4, 44 ; Rom. 7, 55 ; Alam. 9, 3 ; Sord. 10, 24 ; 23, 6 ; 33, 2 ; Zorzi 7, 36 ; Flam. 1705, 3081 ; Barra 500, 883 ; In. It. 15, 289 ; In. Par. 7, 29 ; 14, 1 ; 22, 4 ; Capd. 20, 23 ; 27, 15 ; Vid. 17, 7 ; 21, 43 ; 30, 18 ; Biog. 24, 42 ; Gesta 245, etc.<sup>2</sup> Instead of *tan* we find its compound *aitan* in one instance : C. M. 35, 22, *Dire mel farez a enuiz, Mas non puosc : aitant sui iraz*.

<sup>1</sup>See Tobler, *VB*, i<sup>2</sup>, 134.

<sup>2</sup>For Italian, cf. Monaci, 26, 2, 30, *E certa bene ancoscio, k'a pena mi conoscio, Tanto bella mi pare*.

2. Paratactic consecutive sentences with *si* or *aissi*. These are much rarer than those with *tan*. No examples with inversion of the two sentences to indicate cause are found.<sup>1</sup>

A. With *si* in the interior: Ba. Ch. 96, 33, *Can som remembrat cors nim ditz, Adonc remanc si esbaitz: No sai on vauc ni on me veng; ibid*, 95, 21, *El desiriers de vezer vos Me ten aissi lo cor aissos: Cen vetz prec deu la noit el jor Quem do mort o la vostre amor; Crois*. 591, *E poiches de vitalha i ac si a plantatz: Donec om XXX pas per I denier monedatz*.<sup>2</sup>

B. With *si* at head of sentence: Dan. 11, 36, *Si m'al sen desirs forz duich: No sap lo cors trep ois duoilla; Crois*. 1233, *Car aissi lor es pres: no i a cel nol maldia; In. It*. 34, 52, *Asim nafret gent s'amors: Non sai con m'estia; Ap. Ch*. 6, 177, *Aissi veiras dels mortz encombrat lo gravier: No sera delhiuratz en tot un an entier*.

3. Paratactic consecutive sentences with *tal* or *aital*. Here examples are somewhat more numerous than with *si*, and, as with *tan*, the order of the sentences may be inverted.

A. With *tal* in the interior: Ap. Ch. 6, 173, *Al baissat de las lansas penran tal destorbier: Ja us non atenra ni par ni companer; Gav*. 8, 50, *Elh era assis en tal banc: Ja no saupra mals ques fora; In. Par*. 191, 11, *Mas ieu ai pres tal usatge: totz jorns chant; Dan*. 5, 25, *Ai un tal ver dig adug: Re no sai que mentirs espel; Crois*. 1770; In. Par. 74, 8, etc.<sup>3</sup>

B. With *tal* at head of sentence: Brun. 2, 50, *Quan sa gran beutat remir, Tal joy ai: nom sai nim sen; Crois*. 1296; Flam. 8084. When the relation indicated by the second sentence is causal, *tal* always stands at the head: Born 13, 2, *D'un sirventes nom cal far lonhor ganda: Tal talan ai quel*

<sup>1</sup> Such occur however in Italian: Monaci, 26, 5, 87, *Lo mio core non insomma se non scietto, si m'à stretto Pur di voi, madonna*.

<sup>2</sup> For Italian, cf. Guit. canzone 7, 107, *Temevi si: non osa mettersi 'n voi*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. for Italian, Guit. sonnet 15, 13, *Seraggio tal: non credo esser blasmato*.

*diga e que l'espanda* ; Zorzi, 5, 15, *Estiers ai certanza Qu'eu aurai pen' eternal Enfernal : Tal son fag tuit mei jornal* ; *ibid*, 6, 89 ; Barra 1033, 3179 ; Capd. Un. 5, 37 ; Vid. 37, 8 ; Ap. Ch. 3, 247, etc.<sup>1</sup>

By contamination with the relative-contiguous type of parataxis already discussed, there arise such constructions as the following, in which the relation of the second sentence to the first is attributive. The presence of the indefinite *tal* in the first sentence, however, pointing forward as it does to the second concept of result, entitles us to consider such cases under the general head of parataxis by single words. The particle *tal* here may be either an adjective or a substantive, and the second sentence may contain as common concept either the subject or the object of the first. I have found only one example of the second sentence coördinated with the subject of the first : Ba. Ch. 52, 20, *Tals la cug en baisan tener : Non a mas l'ufana*. Examples relating to the object are more numerous : Ba. Ch. 177, 26, *Car tals n'i a : son tan esquiu Que pois non tornon a cel viu* ; *ibid*, 313, 28, *Tals n'i a : neus del araire Lur levols buous, non dreg gardan* ; Crois. 2128, *Tals C n'i laissan mortz : ja no veiran nadal, Ni lor fara contraria caresma ni carnal* ;<sup>2</sup> Sord. 22, 36, *Tal don deman : ni estre non deuria* ; Daur. 719, *Al filh del duc an fache tal maio : Dedins non a lata ni cabiro*. As in the case of simple juxtaposition, the sentence foreshadowed by *tal* may express a locative or temporal relation : Flam. 6073, *Tal ora fon : non siam certas De sa vida* ; In. Par. 74, 8, *Car s'ieu agues lo mieu sen per folia, Domna, camjat, en tal loc fuy ab vos : Ja no fora marritz ni doloiros*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. for Italian, Monaci, 39, 15, *Io percìd nom lasso d'amarla, oì me lasso, Tale mi mena orgoglio* ; Dante, Inf. 9, 8, *Pure a noi converrà vincer la punga, cominciò ei ; se non . . . tal ne s'offerse*.

<sup>2</sup> Note how the concept is carried forward by *lor* in the second paratactic sentence.

A peculiar shift of meaning occurs in some sentences which otherwise would show simply a causal relation with the inversion of sentence-order already noted. Whereas in the cases cited above the paratactic causal sentence containing the adverb of degree is positive, in these it is negative and indicates that the preceding concept is thought of as unlimited in space or time. The *tan*-sentence is still explanatory of the foregoing, but acquires in this way, somewhat of a concessive force.<sup>1</sup> Such sentences may often be completed in thought by a following consecutive clause in the subjunctive. Thus when Guiraut de Bornelh says (Ba. Ch. 83, 27) *Anc nom vi ni ja non veirai, Tan non irai, D'un sol ome tan bel assai*, it is tolerably certain that the thought is not fully expressed; we may supply, after *irai*, *\*que jol veia*. Cf. further Crois. 324, *E cela ost jutgero mot eretge arder E mota bela eretga ins en lo foc giter, Car convertir nos volon, tan nols podon preier* (sc. *\*que convertiscan*); *ibid*, 1518, *Mas contra la ost de Crist no a castel dureia Ni ciutatz que ilh trobon: tan no es enserreia* (sc. *\*que aia dureia*); *ibid*, 3146; Daur. 340, *Ferrem lo porc, senher, et ieu e vos, El tombara: non er tan vigoros* (sc. *\*que non tomb*); Denkm. 242, 32, *Per o aissom conorta, car dieus es tan lials Q'ab lei trobam merce, tant non em vilh ni fals* (sc. *\*que non trobem merce*); *ibid*, 273, 46; Capd. 12, 3, *Si com sellui c'a pro de valledors En la sasson qu'es desaventuratz Li faillen tuich: ja non er tant amatz* (sc. *\*que non li faillan*), *Mi faill midons*.

When the subjunctive appears in similar paratactic consecutive or causal sentences, the fundamental conception is different. Provençal ordinarily puts side by side two independent statements of fact: *jo sui tan faz: sai triar lo meillor*. The real connection between these two propositions

<sup>1</sup> For similar sentences in Old French, see Dubislav, 21 ff.; and cf. Tobler, *VB.*, I, 131 ff.

is left to the hearer, whose mind is already prepared for the second statement by the adverb of degree in the first. But it is the second sentence which contains the main element of the utterance. If now this main element be conceived as hypothetical or desired, it is put naturally in the subjunctive, and the first sentence generally contains a negation, together with the adverb of degree. This is exactly what Guillem de Poitou does (Ba. Ch. 29, 5), *E sim partez un joc d'amor, No sui tan faz: No sapcha triar lo meillor D'entrels malvatz*. The subjunctive cannot, I think, be considered as establishing a subordination, for the two sentences are as grammatically independent as in the preceding cases. Cf. also Rud. 1, 22, *Anc tan soven no m'adurmi: Mos esperitz tost non fost la: N'i tan d'ira non ac de sa Mos cors: ades no fos aqui*; Dan. 1, 45, *Ja non saubra tant de gandilh: Noil compisses lo groig el cilh*; In. Par. 119, 12, *No sai tan dir de laus: Sa valors no fos plus granda*; <sup>1</sup> *ibid*, 276, 20, *Quan bem albir sa valor, Non aus dir tan de ricor: De mi denhes penre patz*; Capd. 11, 28, *Hom non a tan dur cor: si la ve, Noill port honor*; *ibid*, 23, 26; Ap. Ch. 1, 462; 1, 496; In Flam. 2997, *Adonc si levet someillos, Mais ges non fon si nuaillos: Non anes la fenestr' ubrir*, the degree is expressed by *si*.<sup>2</sup>

In many cases the subjunctive sentence, foreshadowed by the adverb of degree, is related as an attribute to a substantive in the preceding. I regard such sentences as a modification of the paratactic double negative, to be discussed later as a variety of defining parataxis, contaminated to a certain extent by the type just considered. Such a contamination appears, for example, in: Flam. 5272, *E non sai tan*

<sup>1</sup> With the var. lect. *que sa valors*. The *que* must be rejected on account of the metre; but the variant shows how easily the subordinating conjunction could be introduced.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. for Italian, Guit., sonnet 8, 10, *Tanto de dolzor meve donate ch'amorti lo renen si: non m'auccida*.

*fort malanconi: Nom portes d'aisso testimoni; ibid, 7193, Messages mand' a totas partz Que ja non sia tan coartz Negus cavalliers: non remainna; In. Par. 5, 50, No cug jossetz tan avara: Non acsetz qualque dolor al cor; Denkm. 157, 12. Non ha sutz cel home tan bon, Si vas dieu ha s'entencion, E mes tot un pauc a parlar; Sempres no comens a plorar; Ap. Ch. 1, 444, N'i a donne tan riche: no la requiere; Ba. Ch. 37, 23, Noi a ta fort escut: non escantel, No fenda o no pertus o no arcel, Asta reida de fraisser que no astel, Noi a ta fort ausberc: no desclavel.* The last passage is noteworthy through the introduction of the relative *que* in the third line; it shows therefore that to the writer the paratactic and hypotactic constructions were practically equivalent and he places them in correlation here with perfect freedom. The sentence, Mont. 7, 59, *Mas d'aissons prec sius plazia, Dompna, que s'ieu ren dizia Queus fos plazen ni benestan Que de vos n'aja sol aitan: Mi voill' onrar vostre gens cors*, does not properly belong here. I regard it as an example of defining parataxis, the utterance *de vos n'aja sol aitan* being parenthetical and defining the attitude of the speaker's mind to the following wish.

In the examples lately discussed it is an adverb of degree which serves to indicate the relation between the two paratactic sentences. In other cases a temporal adverb may subserve the same purpose. Of these adverbs the most common are *pos* and *tro*. It must, I think, be admitted that these words have in Provençal assumed nearly the function of true conjunctions. The original adverbial force of *pos* and *tro* may, however, still be recognized in many sentences, where for practical purposes editors punctuate the texts as if a true subordinating effect were inherent in these words. So, for example, in Zorzi 3, 5, *Pois fui en vostra comanda, ab petit de jauzimen, Humil et obediens, Amors, m'avetz retengut*, the sense would permit a full stop after *jauzimen* and allow



us to translate *pois* as "then" or "afterwards." The adverbial force of *tro* is likewise evident in sentences which contain a wish subjunctive, juxtaposed with a preceding independent utterance, as in Born 6, 60, *Aragones, nous fassatz plus iratz, Troi diga mais, mas tant vuolh que sapchatz*, where the sense likewise would permit a full stop after *iratz*.

Examples of this usage of *pos* and *tro* are very common in all the texts, the simple form being rather more frequent than the compound hypotactic *posque, troque*. For *pos*, cf. Ap. Ch. 94, 13, *Pois me plages, no cuit q'eu vos desplaia*; Mont. 7, 17, *Quascuna, pus ve son amador, Fi ses error, falh si l'alonga mais*; Dan. 3, 18, *Bona es vida Pos joia la mante*; Crois. 8627; Monk 1, 37; Vid. 40, 32; Alv. 9, 32, etc. For *tro* with the indicative, cf. Vaq. 1, 40, *E cujem lor a totz gent escapar, Tro silh de Piza nos vengron assautar*; Crois. 1288; 4354; 5069; Capd. 2, 28, etc. With the subjunctive, Rom. 9, 58, *A dieu prec per sa doussor Que nos fassa tan d'onor Quens quart de mortal aguag Tro son plazer ajam fag*; Gesta 1915, *E Karles disx li que nos iria encara, tro aguessen fayta batalha am Matran et am Borrelh e qu'elh fos ondradament senhatz per abbat*; <sup>1</sup> Ba. Ch. 154, 17; Brun. 4, 23; Crois. 2019, 2831; Flam. 2243; Vid. 26, 22, etc.

I have noted also one similar example of adverbial *ans* used to indicate the paratactic relation: Crois. 1896, *Ni us cuh que n'ichis: ans vindreit lo pascor*.<sup>2</sup>

The transition from the temporal to the causal conception of relation between sentences is common in most languages, and was easily effected in Provençal in the case of *pos*. Most of the sentences containing this adverb express a cause, as in Ba. Ch. 83, 26, *Cabra joglar, Non pose mudar*,

<sup>1</sup> Note the *que* in the second sentence, correlated with *tro*.

<sup>2</sup> This use of *ante* is not infrequent in Italian; cf. Monaci, 46, 143, *Esto fatto fare poteri inanti scalfi un uovo*; Dino, I, 29, *Io Dino Compagni, desideroso di unità e pace fra' cittadini, avanti si partissero, dissi*.

*Q'eu non chan, pos a mi sap bon*; Brun. 2, 19, *E donca, e quem volon dir Siey huelh? ni quem van queren? Pus ma dolor non enten Ni mos preç non vol auzir*; Born 1, 14; Mont. 2, 21; Dan. 6, 33; Crois. 1978; Monk 2, 31; Rom. 3, 118; Alam. 20, 9; Sord. 8, 19; Vaq. 1, 113; Flam. 277; In. Par. 8, 30, etc.<sup>1</sup>

In the case of "causal" *tant* and *pos* we have in Provençal a good example of the origin of conjunctions. These words possess in the language of the troubadours all their original adverbial force. When used to express a relation between two contiguous sentences, they still have all the vagueness characteristic of such relation-concepts. It is possible, as we have seen, to treat many sentences with *tan* or *pos* as entirely independent utterances, and in most cases it is impossible to say whether they possess subordinating or coördinating force. The Old Provençal speech was in this respect wholly unfixed. No sharp distinction was ever made between words expressing relation and words which correspond to concepts of space or time. It shows too how a language can use elements of many different sources to denote like ideas. The distinction in meaning between a sentence like Born 8, 4, (*Los baros*) *plantavon boissos, tant amon ortz e jardis*, and the variant *pois amon ortz e jardis* is extremely slight. If the adverbial use of both words had died out, it would now be as impossible to trace their earlier history as it is to trace that of Latin *ut* or *enim*.

Another instance of conjunction-making can be observed in Provençal in the case of the adverb *mais*,<sup>2</sup> which seems to be employed in certain passages to replace *poisque*. Cf. Ba. Ch. 51, 14, *Quar li melhor de tot est mon Vos van servir*,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. for Italian, Monaci, 32, 11, *Lo partir non mi vale*; *Ch'adesso mi reprene Amor ch'en omo asende, Poi li piace*; Dante, Canz. x, 136, *Di radica di ben altro ben tira, Poi suo simile è in grado*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Diez, p. 1021, note, and Kolsen, note to Guiraut de Bornelh, I, 20.

*mais a vos platz*; *ibid*, 306, 25; Sord. 22, 6, *E mas nolh plai, farai hueymais mon chan Leu a chantar e d'auzir agradan*; Daur. 123, *Bem podes enrequir mas vos ve per plazir*; In. Par. 116, 27, *E mas ben vuelh, ben auray*; Vid. 24, 49, *Domna, mas no m'en pose sofrir, Deus e chauximens mi valgues, Quem vengues de vos qualsque bes*; Flam. 1942, *Ben segrai vostra voluntat E so qu'aves acostumat, So dis Guillems, mais tan vos plas*; *ibid*, 2927, 3542, 4307, 5383, 6289; Born. 1, 20, etc. I interpret all these cases as contiguous parataxis, with a conceptual relation of cause, reinforced by an adverb signifying "but," "moreover." The first example from Flamenca is instructive, the causal relation being further strengthened by *tan*. In all, *mas* indicates that the causal conception is, to a certain extent, self-evident.

### III. PARATAXIS BY CONTRAST.

A fruitful source of subordinate clauses in all languages arises from the contrast of two concept-groups by some similarity in sound, structure or meaning.<sup>1</sup> Generally in the written language some hint is given, by word-order, repetition or correlation, of the relation existing between the two concepts. Sentences of this sort may range greatly in extent, from those consisting of verbs only to long rhetorical periods. In Provençal the types which are of especial interest are those in which the contrasted concepts imply either a comparison or a condition.

When two subject-concepts are contrasted by means of some quality inherent in each, the simplest way of expressing this relation is by balancing a positive and a negative sentence: "He is rich. I am not rich." If now a word

<sup>1</sup> See Morris, pp. 124-131.

denoting a greater or less degree of the quality be inserted in either sentence, the type remains unchanged grammatically, though the two parts acquire a closer relationship. Thus arises the form we find in Provençal, as, for example, Capd. 23, 13, *Car fis amans Li sui trop meills Non fo d'Iseut Tristans*. The word-order in this and similar sentences leads me to suspect that the original type was: *Fis sui: meills non fo Tristans*, i. e., that the comparative belonged in the second sentence. On the whole it seems most probable that the position of the comparative depended on the place of the *I*-concept; the speaker takes his own condition, act or quality as the basis of comparison with another, who exercises the act or possesses the quality to a greater or less degree. From this stage to the acquirement of complete grammatical subordination by the insertion of a conjunction equivalent to Latin *quam* is but a step. But while taking this step, as the example shows, the language also cast about for another means of reinforcing the idea of relation and found it in the word-order. The Provençal examples all show a well-marked tendency to shift the verb of the second sentence to the head. In fact, whenever a subject is expressed in the second part, it invariably follows the verb, which is generally a *verbum vicarium*, *far* or *esser*. I arrange the examples in two classes; A, those in which no direct conclusion as to order is possible, owing to the lack of an expressed subject; B, those with inversion of subject and verb.

A. No inversion; with *plus* or an organic comparative:  
 Ba. Ch. 124, 16, *Aissi com prez' om plus laida pintura de lonh: no fai quand es pres vengutz*; Ap. Ch. 1, 323, *E as plus homes morz: non saz retraire*; *ibid*, 115, 122; Flam. 125, *Non sai d'aici en Alamainna Negun baron que jai remainna Qu'a cesta cort non venga tost Plus volontiers: non fari' en ost*; In. Par. 91, 16, *E joys qui tost si desrazigua Fai piegz, quant hom lon ve anar: No fetz de be al comensar*.

With *mais*: Ba. Ch. 37, 30, *Mais en a remasutz en plan estel*: *Non a ni vius ni mortz dedins Bordel*; *ibid*, 175, 2; Born 32, 35, *Del rei tafur Pretz mais sa cort e son atur*: *Non fatz cella don fui trahitz*; Alam. 6, 47, *Ieu am trop mais lo glatz*: *No fas las flors dels pratz*; Flam. 1231, *Mais am ieu la mieua folleza*: *Non fas lo sieu sen tan prion*; Denkm. 330, 14; Vid. 9, 46.

B. Subject inverted; with *plus* or an organic comparative: C. M. 22, 20, *Plus soven vens castels e domejos*: *No fai velha gallinas ni capos*; Dan. 3, 46, *Ieu plus ai de joia*; *Non ac Paris d'Elena, cel de Troia*; *ibid*, 14, 49; Sord. 32, 15, *Ad amar prec no voilla un sol auzir Qel vius trai peiz*: *no fai l'autre al morir*; S. Fe 367, *Aqell angels qe i es venguz Aujaz qual deintad i aduz, Corona d'aur qe plus reluz*: *Non fal soleiltz quand es creguz*; Denkm. 338, 48; Vid. 33, 20; Capd. Un. 5, 43, etc.

With *mais*: Dan. 15, 11, *Mais la vol: non ditz la bocal cors*; Monk 4, 16, *Cel qu'aitals es val mais mon escien Ad obs d'amar*: *Non fai ducs ni marques*; Alam. 5, 57, *Per qe pes' en la balansa Mas le mals qes hom en dis*: *No fal le bes ni l'onransa*; Rog. Un. 292, 30, *Mais val d'amor, quant hom n'es enveios Uns bons plorars*: *No fan quatorze ris*; In. Par. 113, 33; Capd. 6, 43; Dicht. 2, 2, 11; 2, 3, 14, etc.<sup>1</sup>

An exactly similar construction, but with the greater degree indicated by a multiplicative, is found in C. M. 34, 1, 38, *Per qem fan que dur dos tans Un mes*: *Non fazi' us ans Qan reignava dompneis ses trahizo*.

I have found only one case of the use of the subjunctive in such contrasted paratactic sentences: Denkm. 333, 24, *Assatz n'a mais drutz de son benvoler Quant de sidonz pot vezet la semblanza, Lo douz esgar, la simpla contenanza*: . . .

<sup>1</sup> For similar sentences in Old French, see Dubislav, 24, 25; Meyer-Lübke, § 538; for Italian, cf. Guit. sonnet, 24, 4, *Tu paghi più l'om sua disianza*: *Non fa quello que tene in signoria*.

*Ja en cellat non sia reis de Fransa.* Here the second contrasted concept is posited as purely hypothetical, hence the subjunctive.

That this originally paratactic construction explains the retention of so-called "expletive" *non-ne* in the later stages of the Romance languages, has already been proved by Dubislav and Tobler.

A second variety of parataxis by contrast is found in those sentences which indicate a concessive or conditional relation. This form has been much studied in the classical languages, and it is generally considered as the source of protasis and apodosis and of the *dum*-clause in Latin. In authors of all periods this type of the paratactic sentence is preserved, the so-called concessive subjunctive being in common use at all epochs. The conceptual association which is the basis of such constructions is the following: the speaker posits as hypothetical or willed a certain relation of subject and predicate, which determines the relation of another subject to another predicate. The contrast is always present implicitly in the thought, but contrasted words do not always appear in the sentences as stated. The most primitive form is, therefore, to be sought in such sentences as Cicero, *Tusc.* 11, 5, *Ne sit summum malum: malum certe est*; Tacitus, *hist.* 4, 58, *sane ego displiceam: sunt alii legati*; or in Provençal: Alam. 5, 60, *Mas tot o revenra lieu: sol li faig non syon grieu*; Capd. Un. 7, 18, *Bona dompna, de totz aips complida, Ja no m'ames: tostemps vos amarai.* In these sentences the contrast finds complete expression in the correlated words *summum malum*—*malum certe*, *ego*—*alii*, *lieu*—*grieu*, *no ames*—*amarai*. In the majority of cases, however, the fundamental contrast is less clearly indicated, though an analysis of the thought always reveals it.

In form, one element of such combinations is prevaillingly an optative subjunctive, which may have a jussive force, as

in Ap. C. 110, 15, *Ja lun hom no vuelas dampnar, Ans lor vuelas ben dir e ffar: Enaychi tu seras amatz.* Occasionally, however, the determining concept is put in the form of an independent imperative or indicative sentence,<sup>1</sup> as in Born 4, 46, *Quan seras lai, no t'enoja, Tu li diras que, s'ar nolh valh ab bran, Elh valrai tost, silh rei nom van bauzan*; Biog. 40, *Richa domna so, em voill maridar. Donc eu dis que aver mi podetz, o voletz per druda o voletz per molher; e conselhatz vos per cal me voletz.*<sup>2</sup>

The interest of the Provençal examples however lies in the means employed by the language to indicate the relation. The contrast residing in the mere juxtaposition of opposing concepts rarely suffices; it is generally heightened by word-order or by the use of single words, adverbs or indefinite pronouns, or by both combined. When the relation is not indicated by an adverb, and frequently when it is, inversion of subject and verb occurs. The sole example I have found with subject expressed and not inverted is Gesta 82, *Done en per amor d'ayssso el aja tantz turmentz per nos suffertatz . . . en per amor d'ayssso devem suffertar per Jhesu Christ.*<sup>3</sup> The contrast is here fully expressed by repetition. The remaining examples fall naturally into the following groups:

A. Without adverb, no subject expressed: Ba. Ch. 77, 2, *En baizan, nius plagues: Ja no volgram solses*; *ibid*, 389, 33, *Seignor, dis el, no vos sia greu, Per sert ieu aconselharia, Si conoisses que be fag sia, Davant Josep nos non anem*; Aug. 6, 59, *E cug, sia Que m'enbria Doncs fadia, M'en partria, S'ieu podia.*

B. Without adverb, with subject inverted: Flam. 2862, *Ara sia queus voill' amar, Vos nous poires de mi aizir Ni eu*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the French *Dis-moi qui tu hantes, je te dirai qui tu es.*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. for Italian, Dino, II, 10, *Signori, volete esser consigliati, fate l'ufficio nuovo, ritornate i confinati a città.*

<sup>3</sup> In the Latin original: *cum igitur . . . passus sit.*

*de vos nulz tems gausir*; Ap. Ch. 3, 588, *Car tant de pretz e de valor Avetz que beus deu dar s'amor Tota domna: sia quis voilla*; Sord. 40, 215, *Queu deu de totz bos aibs usar Tan quan pot, quar fi prez ni car Non aura ja: lausel quis vol*; *ibid*, 11, 6, *Fos qui m'o enseignes, ben me conortaria*;<sup>1</sup> Ba. Ch. 127, 26, *Perqu' eu am mais, s'a lui ven a plazer, Morir de lai que sai vius remaner En aventura: fos mi' Alamanha*; Crois, 2559, *Retengutz fora e pres en aicela sazon: No fos W. d'Encontre, cui Domni-Dieus ben don*; Rog. Un. p. 65, 41, *Pel ben quem n'es escazegutz, Jamais nom n'avengues salut: Li dey tostemps estar als pes*.<sup>2</sup>

C. With adverbs. The chief words employed in Provençal to indicate this relation are *sol*, *ja*, *tant*, more rarely *tal*, *mais*, *pur*, *ancara*.

1. With *sol*, and normal order: C. M. 27, 8, *E cals queus n'atalen Vencerai vos: sol la cortz leials sia*; Mont. 6, 7, *Pro n'ai ieu: sol midons m'ampar*; In. Par. 282, 24, *No vuel plus en aquest mon: Sol dieus mi gart del segon*; Capd. 4, 45, *Après l'ira m'eschaja Tals jois quem deing plazer: Sol fin' amors non traja*.

2. With *sol*, no subject expressed: Born 32, 42, *El bons reis navars, cui dreitz es, Cobraral ab sos Alanes: Sol s'i atur*; Zorzi 6, 44, *Perqu' eram guida alegriers, Car il m'autreja e coventa So don serai parliers*; *Sol de ben far nois repenta*; Vid. 32, 45, *Chanso, vai t'en al bon rei part Cerveira, Que de bon pretz non a el mon egansa: Sol plus francs fos ves mi dons de Cabreira*; Ba. Ch. 49, 1; 124, 23; 154, 7; 360, 11; Flam. 173, 218, 997, 2024, 2534, 2633, 3795, 7602.

<sup>1</sup> This type of parataxis, with indefinite subject formed by a relative clause, goes back to Latin; cf. Plautus, Pers. 373, *Dicat quod quisque volt: ego non demovebo*.

<sup>2</sup> For Old French, see Dubislav, 16, 17; for Italian, cf. Guit., canzone 20, 93, *Gentil mia donna, fosse in voi tesoro Quanto v'è senno in cor, la più valente Fora ver voi neente*; but without inversion, Dino, III, 5, *facendo noi pace, e Pistoia rimanesse a' nostri avversarii, noi saremo ingannati*.



3. With *sol*, and inverted order: Ap. Ch. 102, 9, *Sil vuelh ofrir Lai don venir Me pot complid' aiuda: Sol nom si' irascuda La maire dieu*; Sord. 19, 33, *Sol creza leis, en cuy ay m'esperansa, Qu'ieu si' arditz, Bertran, ab gaug entier Viurai tostemp*; Zorzi 17, 46, *Car sol fos faitz en lieis aitals acortz, Aissi cum es senes par sa beutatz, Volria amors c'a mi vengues la sortz D'esser de joi senes par aondatz*; Dan. 15, 40.

4. With *ja*,<sup>1</sup> no inversion: Monk 6, 19, *E ja de leis bes nom veigna Tos temps li serai aclis*; *ibid*, 15, 20, *Mas gaps avetz be ad equal d'un rey: Ja us vers non sia*; Flam. 7831, *E cil qui es joves no i eira*; *Ja veilla no sia, o quiera*; In. It. 66, 3, *Lo plus fis drutz q'anc nasqes Seri' eu, s'ami' ages, Qe, ia plaiser nom feses, Ben fora sos hom ades*; In. Par. 226, 65, *Tan val sa lausors saupuda De bon pres sauput Q'a liei m'autrei per retengut, Gia nom fos tenguda*; Capd. *Perqu'eu vos am, ja autre pro noi aja, Tan fianmen que d'al re nom sove*; *ibid*, 18, 26.<sup>2</sup>

5. With *ja*, and inversion: In. It. 24, 554, *Ja non ajas vos re, Vostre noms n'er saupuz*; Bornelh 1, 18, *Ja siatz vos, donsela, bell' e blonda, Pauc d'iraus notz e paucs jois vos aonda*; *ibid*, 1, 63, *Beus eu valrai: ja l'ai' eu mantenguda, Si mais nous i mesclats*; Rog. 3, 60, *E vuelh mais morir ad estros: Jal sapcha negus hom mas vos*; Biog. 40, *Vos etz mot gentil hom: ja siatz vos canorges*.

6. With *tan*.<sup>3</sup> Here the contrast-relation is sometimes difficult to distinguish from that of defining parataxis hereafter to be considered. Take for example a sentence like

<sup>1</sup> For examples in Old French, see Dubislav, 17.

<sup>2</sup> In late Provençal, the locution *ja sia so que, ja sia aisso que*, has become a conjunction, like French *jaçoit que*; cf. Ap. Ch. 109, 7; Gesta 73, 660, 1455, 2019, etc.

<sup>3</sup> The latest study of such sentences is that by Ebeling, in the *Festschrift für Adolf Tobler*, Braunschweig, 1905. Cf. the remarks by Tobler, *Archiv f. neueren Sprachen*, cxv, 244, and Dubislav, 18-20.

Sord. 33, 2, *El mon non es domna, tan sia pros, Ques defendes de mos dos precs plazens*. It is obvious that the relation of subject to predicate in the main utterance is contingent on the hypothetical relation in the second sentence only in so far as it is conceived by the speaker to fall short of universal validity in respect to some stated quality; "no lady,—let her possess to the highest degree the quality *pros*,—can defend herself from my sweet words." That the essential element of the paratactic relation is still one of contrast, is often indicated by the repetition or correlation of single words, as in Sirv. Jog. 14, 22, *Anc ab armas non sab valer Hom meinz, tant s'en volgues guabar*, where *meinz* and *tant* express the full force of the opposition in thought. Cf. also C. M. 5, 24, *Anc non fo cors mieills taillatz ni depens Ad ops d'amar : sia tant greus ni lens*; Ap. Ch. 105, 92 (Boeci), *Hanc no fo om ; ta grant vertut agues, Qui sapiencia compenre pogues*; *ibid*, 105, 178, *Hanc no vist omne ; ta grant onor agues, Sil forfez tan dont ellas rancures, Sos cors ni s'anma miga per ren guaris*; Sirv. Jog. 15, 22, *E non aves senhoril : Tant aut son dur cor apil, Que jaius trobon en plan mil Per quem pren de vos pezansa*.

7. With other adverbs or indefinite pronouns. Of exactly similar nature are the following examples with *tal*, *pur*, *mais*, *ancara*: Dan. 7, 40, *L'us conseilla e l'autre brama, Per queis desmanda Amors, tals fora granda*; Denkm. 313, 73, *Ni non ai tan coral amic Qu'eu nol tengue per enemie, Dompna : pur vos m'ordenisses*,<sup>1</sup> *ibid*, 31, 1054, *Senhors, aujas que vos direm ; Ja sol un motz no mentirem. Cant venc a nueg, a mieja nueg, Mays nous ho tengas ad enueg, Tota la terra si crollet*; Ap. Ch. 1, 166, *Ia mais ne li estot sofrate aver : Mas pur face iustise e die ver*; Ba. Ch. 301, 16, *E egalment devunt tuit partir las causas del mort, ancora*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. for Italian, Monaci, 41, 5, 6, *Pote omo fare tal movimento, Pur asgio n'agia*.

*non i sia negus que non aja ben en outra guisa*;<sup>1</sup> *Ibid*, 301, 25.

It is evident, however, that even with these aids of word-order or adverbial determinants Provençal did not make much progress toward grammatical subordination. The occasional use of the coördinating conjunction *e* to introduce such hypothetical conditional sentences, shows that they were regarded as independant concepts. Cf., for instance, Capd. 21, 20, *Mas en midonz ve que nos faill en re Nim pot aver tort, e volgues m'aucire*: Flam. 4145, *Quar esquerns vers enuja plus, E ja non sia neis mais us, Que non farion C messongier*; In. Par. 62, 55, *Que bos volers, e ja le faitz noy fos, Si deu per fag contar tolas sazoz*.

A last variety of parataxis by contrast is furnished by what Dubislav calls the disjunctive concessive form.<sup>2</sup> In this type the validity of a statement is conditioned by two correlated wish-sentences, independent in form, which, by positing two contradictory hypotheses, tend likewise to establish the universality of the main utterance. Sentences of this type may be arranged in the following two divisions.

A. With two or more verbs in the wish-sentence: Ba. Ch. 59, 26, *El l'amarai, be li plass' o belh pes, Qu'om no pot cor destrenher ses aucire*; *ibid*, 59, 28; 392, 30; Brun. 1, 34, *Ab dous semblans, vuelh' o non denh', Pren los uns els autres destrenh*; Crois. 5004, *Baro, so ditz lo coms, o vos plassa o vos pes, Desgarnitz o garnitz o en lonc o en tes, Intrarei en la viala, e verei ben qui es*; Monk 8, 32, *Cossi que vos en captengnatz, Vos amarai: ous plass' ous pes*; Rom. 13, 74, *O muer' o viu, a vos mi ren*; Barra 844, *Que luns hom, per lunha razo, Dins lo camp non auses intrar Ni als campios ajudar: Fos crestias o fos sarrazis*; Vid. 24, 3, *Nuls*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. for Italian, Monaci, 36, 2, 18, *Par k'eo n'agia avante Si kom om ke si crede Salvarsi per sua fede, Ancor non vegia avante*.

<sup>2</sup> See Dubislav, 22.

*om nos pot d'amor gandar, Pos el seu senhoriu s'es mes : O tot li plas' o tot li pes, Sos talens l'avem a seguir.*

B. With single verb, but double predicate : Ap. Ch. 14, 12, *E fassa caut o freidura, Trastot m'es d'una mezura Amors e joys, d'eyssa guiza* ; *ibid*, 84, 11, *La nued el jorn mi ven en pessamens Qu'ieu cavalgue ab totz mos valedors Dreyt a Sant Pos, sia sen o folhors* ; *ibid*, 95, 47 ; Crois. 8315, *Car per la crotz sanctisma, sia sens o foldatz, Nos irem per la gata si vos o comensatz* ; Sord. 23, 3, *Sa vidas trai, venha l'en mals o bes, Quar per quascu mor, languen, de dezire* ; In. Par. 113, 28, *Pus aissim suy acordatz : Fassa mi amor o no* ; *ibid*, 121, 5 ; 191, 11 ; Capd. 16, 20, *Car el mon non es res : Sia senz o follors, Qu'eu pensses queill plagues : Nom fos gauz o douçors* ; S. Fe 450, *S'ad ella ven hom cegs o muz, . . . Pos devant ella n'er tenduz, O sia jovens o canuz, Si de peccaz es peneduz, Semprel venra gauz e salutz.*

#### IV. PARATAXIS BY DEFINITION.

Following Professor Morris, I have ventured to employ this somewhat ambiguous term to denote that variety of parataxis which arises when a verb is inserted parenthetically into a longer sentence to express a thought which comes to the speaker's mind and which he utters at once without waiting to finish the statement in process of utterance.<sup>1</sup> The parenthetical thought is not necessarily parenthetical in grammatical expression ; it may be, and quite often is, prefixed or appended. It may be recognized in that it adds no new element to the original concept, but merely defines the attitude of the speaker's or hearer's mind to it. When the Provençal said "eu cug : vendra," the verb *cug* served simply to define his own position in regard to the main statement *vendra*.

<sup>1</sup> See Morris, *Methods in Syntax*, pp. 126, 132.

This kind of paratactic relation is richly represented in Early Latin, where it has been exhaustively studied by Morris.<sup>1</sup> It recurs likewise abundantly in the mediæval Romance dialects, so that it seems justifiable to assume a genetic relation between the Plautine *mercator credost* (Poen. 1016) and the Provençal *sas plazens dolors cre l'auciran* (Ap. Ch. 84, 28), which show exactly the same incorporation of the parenthetical verb into the main utterance; or between the Plautine *ergo animum aduortas uolo* (Capt. 383) and the Provençal *nostre reis aragones que val mais de totz los pros vuelh renovelh vostr' arnes* (Sirv. Jog. 8, 23). Nor is it possible to explain the construction in either language by the ellipse of a conjunction. *Volo abeas* does not stand for *volo ut abeas*, nor does *vuelh venha* represent a hypothetical original *vuelh que venha*. The two sentence-forms, it is evident, are genetically related, and both go back to a time when conjunctions were not in use. The Plautine type reappears in the later Latin authors who affect a more colloquial speech; cf. Varro, r. r. 1, 2, 26, *est satius dicas*; Petronius, Cena Tri. 129, *crede mihi non intellego*; St. Cyprian, ep. 8, 3, *sed et vos petimus memores sitis*. And it is abundantly represented in the works of Gregory of Tours:<sup>2</sup> hist. fran. 3, 13, *et credo ob illius causa fuerit ipsum castrum in manibus traditum iniquorum*; conf., p. 753, *velim diceris quid vidisti*. A continuous tradition between Early Latin and the Romance languages may easily be established.

With this general agreement between early Latin and Provençal, there are to be observed several noteworthy differences. Parataxis in questions, with an inserted verb of mental action or will to express the attitude or the desire of the hearer, is very common in Plautus.<sup>3</sup> My material in

<sup>1</sup> In *Amer. Journ. of Phil.*, xviii, especially pp. 202-301.

<sup>2</sup> See Bonnet, pp. 666 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Rud. 1269, *censen hodie despondebit eam mihi, quaeso?* Epid. 584, *quid loquar vis?*

Provençal has thus far afforded only a single case of this type: Ap. Ch. 5, 225, *Non sabies degues venir?* This I believe to be due, partly at least, to chance. Direct questions of any kind are not common in lyric poetry; if we possessed a true dramatic literature we should doubtless find this type of sentence well represented. On the other hand, the very common Provençal type *non cug venha* seems to be sparingly if at all represented in Latin. Cf., however, Gregory of Tours, hist. fran. 5, 14, *credo acceptum non fuisset deo*, which would undoubtedly become in Provençal, by attraction of the negation, *non cre fos retengutz per deu*. In addition, the generalized double negative sentence, of the type *non es om non venha*, is unknown to Latin authors of all periods. Keeping in mind these differences, I shall adopt Morris' classification in treating these forms of parataxis.

1. Sentences showing insertion of a verb of mental action to indicate the attitude of the speaker or hearer to the main utterance, which is always in the indicative. Type: *cre venra*.<sup>1</sup> In Latin such verbs are always in the first person singular, but in Provençal they occur also in the second person, the parenthetical *sapchatz* "know ye" being especially common. Originally such verbs stood in the middle of the phrase, but later they came to be prefixed or appended. They generally consist of a simple finite verb-form, sometimes with an added pronoun or adverb intensive in meaning. Not infrequently the thought may be carried over by a personal or demonstrative pronoun object of the verb of mental action, which serves to sum up the main concept already expressed or at least present in the mind. So, for example, Ba. Ch. 249, 21, *Don enueja mout a Jaufre E a Brunessen mais, so cre*, where the *so* sums up all the preced-

<sup>1</sup> For Old French, see Dubislav, 4-5, but the author's treatment of these forms is brief.

ing statement; Crois. 2633, *Aicels de Savardu lor tolot vin el pan, E no vendemieren, so cug, mais a d'un an*; Capd. Un. 4, 22, *La genser es que anc nasques de maire E la meilhs, so aug a totz retraire*; Crois. 1449, *Bochart, so li a dit, vos estes, ben o sai, De mot granda natura e proz om e verai*; *ibid*, 1560, *Que ja nulhs hom del segle, so sapchatz de vertat, No partira de leis entro agues manjat*; Monk 4, 20, *Aitals vos son ab ferm voler, Bona dompna de fin cor, so sapchatz*; Sord. 24, 17, *Ilh fai orguelh, ben o sai, Quar l'am*; Vid. 24, 30, *E non o dic eu, so sapchatz, Per so quem fassa mortz paor, Mas quar ilh pert son amador*; *ibid*, 29, 30. But the majority of cases are without any single word to indicate the relation.

1. With inserted verb of thinking: C. M. 3, 18, *Que s'abans anam a la mort D'aut, eu cug, aurem alberc bas*; Zorzi, 1, 57, *Per qu'eu cui dregz Non pot cobrar pidanza*; Flam. 2138, *Na Tor, fai s'el, bell' est defor, Ben cug dedins est pur' e clara*; Dan. 10, 23, *Ab trop voler cug lam toli S'om ren per ben amar pert*; Ap. Ch. 84, 28; Crois. 3146, 1248.<sup>1</sup>

2. With inserted verb of knowing: Mont. 14, 25, *Sordel, mais val veramen, Sapchatz, lo cor e il talen*; Daur. 1620, *Ben per ver sapiatz Noil farai mal, ans sera be gardatz*; Ba. Ch. 122, 23, *Pero ben sai mos lauzors pro nom te*; Crois. 5392, 5764, 7727; Flam. 7029; In Par. 62, 55; 70, 38; 76, 5; Ap. Ch. 60, 44, etc.<sup>2</sup>

3. With inserted verb of saying or promising: Ba. Ch. 198, 10, *Pero beus die, totz temps serai clamos*; S. Fe 333, *Jur vos, perls deus d'agest clocher E per agelz cui eu profer, Car comprare est reprober*; In Par. 156, 40, *Pograi dir als fis amadors, Mos fis joys part totz creys e sors*; Vid. 41, 24,

<sup>1</sup> For Italian, cf. Guit., sonnet 2, 12, *Ben credo la vorresti altro servire*.

<sup>2</sup> For Italian, cf. Guit., canzone 20, 30, *Al qual donna saven (= sappiamo) meglio contende*.

*De mi dic ben, si pel marques no fos, No pretz cinc mares una rota camiza* ; Crois. 2985 ; Rom. 6, 43, etc.

When the parenthetical verb is in the third person, as sometimes happens, it indicates in a similar manner the mental attitude of the person to whom the main utterance is directed, as in Capd. 17, 33, *Pus del tot li sui mentire, Sivals aitan sapcha nol men* ; or more commonly it shows the attitude of the person whose utterance is reported, as in Crois. 1854, *Be sabon e lur cor no lor poiran durar* ; *ibid*, 2605, *Mas el lor a jurat per los sants d'outra mar Non laisara a vida un solet escapar* ; *ibid*, 4236 ; Daur. 402 ; Flam. 4339, etc.<sup>1</sup>

An increasing tendency in the language, which led eventually to complete grammatical subordination, appears in some sentences. The inclination was persistent to regard the main utterance as depending on the inserted verb. This tendency is shown in the attraction exercised by the parenthetical verb, as in Ap. Ch. 1, 1, *Carles veit de Girart, nel pout trobar A plane terre en camp, si com sol far*, where the object of the chief proposition is attached as an adverbial modifier to the defining verb, and also by the fact that sometimes a second coördinated sentence is introduced by *que*, as in Crois. 2284, *Per tot fan entendre : Frances son descofit E quel coms de Montfort s'en es de noit fugit*.

A peculiar variety of this kind of parataxis arises when the speaker makes a declaration and then by means of an independent wish-sentence, generally introduced by *sic*, solemnly attests its truth. I regard this adjuration or prayer as an after-thought, which determines or defines the relation of the speaker to the main utterance, much as an intercalated *eu cre* or *eu dic* would do. It closely approximates, however, the form of parataxis by contrast, already considered, as the wish-sentence is so far conditional that

<sup>1</sup> For Italian, cf. Dino, 1, 22, *Uno masnadiere de' Donati, il quale si disse fu Piero Spini*.



the absolute validity of the main utterance depends upon it. Often a wish of this kind is intercalated parenthetically into the main proposition,<sup>1</sup> as in Vid. 8, 27, *Mas ma Lob' am si conques Que : si m'ajut deus ni fes : Al cor m'estan sei dous vis ;* *ibid*, 28, 40, *E s'eu li pogues mal voler : Si deus m'ampar : de mon poder, Li for' eu mals et orgolhos.* Cf. also Ba. Ch. 250, 19, *O ieu, que anc non l'ac major, Dis Jaufres : sim sal dieus ni fes ;* Biog. 101, *Domna, sim vailla dieus, de l'ora en sai que fui vostre servir, nom poc entrar en cor nuls pessamens que non fossetz la mierz qu'anc nasques ;* *ibid*, 102, *Guillem si dieus e fes vos vailla, avetz domna per cui cantatz ?* In Par. 75, 44, *Ieu nulh temps no faria Forssadamen so qu'ieu dezir : Aissi dieus gui lo caiteus doloiros ;* Crois. 1035, *Perqu'ieu : si m'ajud fes, no m'en fas meravelha, Si om be los confon ;* Vid. 37, 17, *Si m'ajut deus, peccat fai criminal Ma bela domna, can ilh nom socor.*

B. Sentences showing insertion of a verb of mental action to indicate the relation of the speaker (rarely of the hearer) to a hypothetical statement. Type: *non cre venha.* This type is a fruitful source of subjunctive clauses in all the Romance languages. The main points of interest connected with it are the questions as to whether the use of the subjunctive implies subordination of thought, and as to the original position of the negation. The meaning of the independent potential subjunctive in Latin varied widely, but it often expressed the conviction of the speaker in regard to an action in a supposed case, as in Plautus, Ba. 1184, *quem quidem ut non hodie exerceam, alterum tantum auri non meream ;* M. G. 736, *qui deorum consilia culpet, stultus inscitusque sit.* Though no verb of mental action is present, the thought is essentially the same as it would be in Provençal *non cre miera tan d'aur.* Occasionally, even in

<sup>1</sup> Similar Latin wish-subjunctives in Plautus, often containing the name of a god, are given by Morris, *Subjunctive*, p. 150.

Latin, such potentials were accompanied by a verb of mental action, as in Asin. 465, *Sauream non novi. At nosce sane. Sit, non sit: non edepol scio.* If now in such expressions the verb of mental action be prefixed or intercalated, we get the Provençal type fully developed, as in Dan. 11, 36, *Si m'al sen desirs fors duich, No sap lo cors trep ois duoilla.* The parenthetical defining character of the inserted verb is still more apparent in cases like Ba. Ch. 261, 28, *E portatz lim aquest angel, Qu'el mon non cug n'aya pus bel.* In my opinion, it is the hypothetical negative sentence which is original and which contains all the essential elements of the thought. Then, some time before the earliest Provençal literary monuments, it must have become customary to insert in such sentences, generally at the beginning, a verb of mental action to indicate more clearly the speaker's attitude toward the supposed action. Next, the negation was displaced by attraction, and formed an ever closer union with the inserted verb. The attraction did not, however, always take place, as is apparent from a consideration of such sentences as Flam. 1011, *De lui si partol cumpanho E cujon ben non sia sas*; S. Fe 531, *S'aichi fos Judas Machabeus, . . . O Josue oll paucs Zacheus, Czom cuid, no foss totz lo jogs seus*, which are clearly analogous to such Late Latin constructions as Greg. Tur. Mart. 490, *putavi quasi vas esset effractum*; hist. franc. 8, 20, *quod credo providencia dei fecissit.* After the attraction, the next step would be the insertion of the subordinating conjunction *que*, and the reduction of the originally independent sentence to an object clause would be accomplished.<sup>1</sup> An example like Cerc. 6, 27, *Cist serven fals fan a plusors gequir Pretz e joven e lonhar ad estros, Don proeza non cug que sia mais, Qu'escarsetatz ten las claus dels baros,*

<sup>1</sup> If the main utterance be thought of as actually existing, the indicative is used, as in Rud. 7, 27, *Grailles e fresca ab cor plazen, E non cre gensser s'enseigna*, which is otherwise of the usual type. Such cases are very rare.

shows how easily the main utterance became subordinate grammatically, even though the inserted verb retained its parenthetical character.

Of sentences of this type<sup>1</sup> by far the most common are those which contain a verb of thinking, *cuidar* or *creire*, in the first person: Ba. Ch. 54, 17, *L'segles non cuit dure gaire, segon qu'escriptura di*; Ap. Ch. 77, 52, *A totas gens dic e mon serventes Que, si vertatz e dreitura e merces Non governon home en aquest mon, Ni sai ni lan no cre valors l'aon*,<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, 85, 41; 105, 42; Aug. 7, 17, *E ges non ay crezensa, Per nulha ren que sia, Puesca querir, s'eu no complisc lo joc*; Born 29, 27, *Eu non cuich lais Caorz ni Caiarc Mos Oc e Non*; *ibid.*, 28, 34; Sirv. Jog. 3, 38, *Tu es joglaretz novels, Ogan no cre recepchas Draps entiers envoutz de pels*; *ibid.*, 23, 21; 23, 48; Crois. 184, *Quant lo coms de Tolosa e li autre baro El vescoms de Bezers an auzit li sermo Que los Frances se crozan, no cug lor sapcha bo*; Alv., p. 142, 17, *Mas ieu no cre pros dompna denh Far drut molherat gelos brau*; Rog. 4, 32, *Fas ton talen, mas ieu no cug ni cre Tan quan vivras n'ayas nulh jauzimen*; Gav. 1, 48, *E nom pes negus m'en desmenta*; *ibid.*, 4, 7; 6, 48; 8, 38; Sord. 40, 115; In. It. 82, 10; Vid. 5, 30; Blac. 5, 33; Flam. 6974, etc.<sup>3</sup>

The attraction exercised by the defining verb is clearly shown by a sentence like Born 28, 27, *Del senhor de Mirandol Qui ten Cruisa e Martel, No cre, ogan se revel*. Here the subject of the main statement becomes by attraction an adverbial modifier of the inserted verb.

Much less frequently we find the defining verb in the second person: Ap. Ch. 22, 34, *Puois sui per lui aissi ausartz*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dubislav, 4, 5; Meyer-Lübke, § 557.

<sup>2</sup> In this sentence the hypothetical character of the subjunctive *aon* is clearly indicated by the preceding protasis.

<sup>3</sup> For Italian, cf. Guit., canzone 12, 21, *Mai de servir lei non credo penta*; Dante, sestina III, 13, *non credo fosse mai virtute in erba Di tal salute*.

*Que nous cuidetz lanssas ni dartz M'espaven, ni aciers ni fers ;* Flam. 1186, *Et on plus hom a lui o chanta, Nous cujes sos mals cors l'eschanta ;* In. Par. 42, 10, *En dos amicx, pus que y es fin' amors, Ja nous cugetz loncx respiegz s'i empenda.* In these cases the inserted verb expresses the relation which the hearer is to assume toward the hypothetical concept in question. Similarly, when the verb is in the third person, it indicates the attitude to be assumed by the third party. I have found only one example: Ba. Ch. 123, 25, *Pero nos cuit, si bem sui irascutz, Sitot me dic en chantan ma rencura, Jal diga ren que si' outra mezura.*

Sentences in which the main utterance is affirmative are much less common. In such cases the potential character of the subjunctive often shades off into an expression of desire. So in In. Par. 13, 19, *Estra lur grat cre jois m'albere*, the original concept *jois m'albere* is clearly a wish, to which a determinant is added by the defining verb *cre*. Cf. also In. It. 82, 10, *D'amor mor eu plangen tot l'an ; Si pens fassan li autre fin aman ;* Gav. 5, 20, *Dombridieus cre m'o apparelh ;* *ibid.*, 9, 20, *Tant an d'erguelh sils q'a tuatz Q'els cujol mons lui si' aclis ;* Ap. Ch. 105, 202 (Boeci), *Tant a Boecis lo vis esvanuit Que el so pensa uel sien amosit ;* Crois. 2279, *Ans segon lur esmansa cujan sian (li crozatz) vencut ;* *ibid.*, 6281 ; Denkm. 70, 2321, *Car pessaron Messias sia Que atendo, e fan follia ;* Daur. 621 ; Flam. 990, 3840, 6916 ; In. Par. 60, 3.

All the sentences thus far studied contain the present subjunctive. The use of the imperfect subjunctive is not so frequent, although many examples are at hand. By some,<sup>1</sup> the shift of tense is considered a sign of partial subordination, but it is difficult to trace such a distinction in Provençal. The verb of mental action seems to be just as

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Schmalz, *Lateinische Syntax*<sup>3</sup>, § 267.

much of an addition, an afterthought, as in the instances already considered. Where the imperfect appears, its employment seems to be determined by a protasis, either actually present or implied in the thought. That it is original in the main utterance, and not determined by the tense of the defining verb, is shown by such examples as the following, where the insertion is in the present: Flam. 2172, *Aitals plazers esperitals, Ben cug valgues unas daneras*; *ibid.*, 4884; Ba. Ch. 224, 20, *E membram be, cals c'os disses, E cug fos n'Arnautz de Maruelh*; *ibid.*, 264, 42; Ap. Ch. 9, 90, *Ni no me puese passar per re Aquel effan fag o agues*; *ibid.*, 38, 38, *Mas s'ilh auzis con li sui fis E leials ses tot cor vaire, Non crei sufris C'aissi languis Fins amanz e mercejaire*; Dan. 18, 28, *Tant fina amors cum cella qu'el cor m'intra Non cuig fos anc en cors non eis en arma*; Crois. 497, *E los clercs auzieian li fols ribautz mendics E femnas e efans, c'anc no cug us n'ichis*; *ibid.*, 1291, 1302; In. Par. 5, 50, *No cug fossetz tan avara Non acsetz qualche dolor al cor*; Monk 5, 89; Flam. 738, 7485.

In the other cases, the defining verb is in the conditional (a) or the preterite (b): a, Ba. Ch. 108, 18, *Qu'eu vi l'or' e vos la vitz, Non cuidera res amiranz mi mogues*; *ibid.*, 222, 10; Crois. 1770, *E fan aital chaplei, Quin volia ver diire cujeratz fos gabei*; Monk 4, 18, *Sa ricors cujarial valgues*; Flam. 5230, *Ben cujera Jupiter fos O alcus dels dieus amoros*; *ibid.*, 5636; b, Ba. Ch. 250, 20, *Diable cugiei aguesson pres*; Crois. 1007, *E eu cugei aguessan fail patz e establida*; Capd. Un. 3, 33, *A, com cuidei fos<sup>1</sup> dinz d'aital color Co m'aparec deforas per semblan*; Vid. 21, 3, *Eu cugei acsetz conquiza La gensor e la plus gaja*.

The insertion of other verbs of mental action than those of thinking or knowing is rare in Provençal. I have noted

<sup>1</sup> This subjunctive is clearly optative.

it only with verbs of promising, as in Ap. Ch. 1, 644, *E iurava sor sains, com om leiaus, Ia mais tan com el fust vis om carnaus, Ne vos venges per lui noise ni maris*; *ibid.*, 30, 12, *E sim sentis lo cor ferm Quel plagues, bel fauc fermansa: Ja mos chantars tritz ni braus Non fos ni de razon brava*; Flam. 2046, *E jam promessest vos l'autrier A bona fem cossellasses*.

C. In sentences which express some of the various shades of meaning denoted by the term jussive, all in the subjunctive, a verb is inserted indicating more definitely the relation of the speaker, hearer or a third person to the main utterance. Such sentences may be either positive or negative; but in the latter case the negation is mostly attracted to the inserted verb, though the union is never so strong as in the case of the Latin *nolo amet*. The Provençal types are thus: *vuelh venha* and *non vuelh venha*. The verb of the main utterance is nearly always in the second or third person. The only cases with the first person which I have found are the following: In. Par. 52, 58, *Seguros ses espaventalh Vuelh fassam d'els tal esparpalh Que sial camps per nos retengutz*; Flam. 7738, *E vol per pres a vos mi renda*; Cerc. 2, 37, *S'elha nom vol, volgra moris Lo dia quem pres a coman*; Rom. 7, 31, *Ben volgr' aguessem un senhor Ab tan de poder e d'albir Qu'als avols tolques la ricor*; In. Par. 117, 25, *Lo jorn volgra fos part Roais*; Ba. Ch. 361, 14, *Mi dons . . . que de lonc temps no avia volgut fossem ensemps*; *ibid.*, 389, 36, *Senher, dis el, no vos sia greu, Per sert ieu acosselharia, Si connoisses que be fag sia, Davant Josep nos non anem*; Sirv. Jog. 3, 2, *Joglaretz, petit Artus, si vols t'enjoglarisca, Ni vols segre aquest us, Dreitz es qu'ieu t'en garnisca*; Flam. 6845, *Cant mi dises Qu'ieu de vos mi parta voles*; In. It. 5, 41, *Mezuram ditz no si' escas, Ni ja trop d'aver non amas*; Cerc. 1, 10, *E quin diria m'en partis Fariam morir des era*. Of these, all but the last four examples follow the usual type, the verb of willing, advising or ordering being clearly paren-

thetical. The whole gist of the statement lies in the subjunctive wish-concept, and the inserted verb serves only to make more definite the attitude of the speaker to his own wish. The last four, however, show a shift of person, due to the fact that they are really reported wishes, but preserve otherwise the original form. For example, what Artus really said was (Sirv. Jog. 3, 2): *vuelh m'enjoglariscatz*. This is reported by the Dalfin in the form: *si vols t'enjoglarisca*. Such examples show what may be called a partial subordination.

In all other cases, the main utterance is in the second or third person, and the defining verb in the first person, rarely in the second or third. With the verb in the second person we have for example, C. M. 23, 36, *Uns cans enrabjatz No voillaz ja venga*, which shows clearly the nature of the inserted verb. *Venga* alone would have conveyed the speaker's wish; *voillaz* defines the hearer's duty in relation to it. As in the familiar Latin *nolo*-type, the negation is attracted to the intercalated verb. So for the third person: Dan. 11, 49, *Arnautz vol sos chans sia ofertz Lai on doutz motz mou en agre*. Here, as before, the subjunctive sentence is complete in itself; the prefixed *Arnautz vol* expresses the defining relation of the poet to his own wish.

Sentences containing the imperfect subjunctive do not differ in essentials from those with the present. The device of denoting a non-realizable wish by the past tenses of the mood<sup>1</sup> had long been in existence, and the proper definition is then indicated by the insertion of a verb, mostly conditional in form: Ba. Ch. 62, 16, *Tot arma crestiana volgra agues tal jai Cum eu agui et ai*; Born 19, 7, *E degram estar soau C'aitan volgra volgues mon pro Na Lana Cum lo senher de Peitau*; Vid. 20, 50, *Na Viern', en patz Volgra fos castiatz*.

<sup>1</sup> See Meyer-Lübke, §§ 118-19.

Omitting then these differences of person and tense, I distinguish the following types of defining parataxis in jussive sentences :

1. With verb inserted parenthetically into the subjunctive sentence. a. With verb of willing : Sirv. Jog. 8, 23, *Nostre reis aragones Que val mais de totz los pros Vuelh renovelh vostre' arues* ; Sord. 5, 29, *Et apus vuelh del cor don om al rey navar* ; Daur. 920, *Mos amicx vuelh siatz* ; *ibid.*, 1222, 1510 ; Mont. 14, 42, *Perque mon fin cor qu'ieulh ren, Vuelh sapch' on qu'ilh estia* ; Ba. Ch. 83, 21 ; 269, 42 ; Ap. Ch. 89, 3 ; 89, 5 ; Flam. 5433, 6781 ; Born 8, 25 ; 8, 33 ; 31, 31 ; Dicht. 2, 2, 37.<sup>1</sup>

b. With verbs of ordering and advising : In. Par. 25, 23, *Mas sil drutz premers l'enguana, Enguans, si floris, non grana, Lai felnei, Ses mercei, Mas ben gart no s'en sordei* ; Rud. 1, 34, *E sel que de mil apenra, Gart nol franha ni nol pessi*.

c. With verbs of asking : Ap. Ch. 9, 213, *Senher Josep, per dieu vos prec, L'effant Jhesus me mostrasses* ; Sord. 10, 12, *Per quel compte voill pregar non li pes S'ab lui non pas* ; In. Par. 65, 26, *Perqu'ieus prec me valques Ab vos, domna, fin' amors e merces*.

2. With verb prefixed to the subjunctive sentence.

a. With verb of willing : C. M. 35, 14, *Demandaz cum ? voill o sapchaz* ; Born 35, 65, *Volh sapchal reis et aprenda De son grat e fassa chantar Mos sirventes al rei navar* ; Flam. 758, *Eu voil sian franc tut vostre fieu* ; Mont. 5, 15, *Be volr' agues enveya Le reys qu'ab Frances mogues tenza*.

b. With verb of ordering : Ba. Ch. 111, 32, *El a fait per tot mandar, eya, Non sia jusqu'a la mar, eya* ; Flam. 6143, *Amiga, vai, e digas li Non sa entre, que pause mi* ; Ba. Ch. 56, 3, *Gardatz s'en ben bedoi* ; Rom. 3, 8, *Bels dous amics, e guarda not trics, Si vols que mortz non sia* ; Ap. Ch. 1, 227,

<sup>1</sup> Fôr Italian, cf. Monaci, 46, 16, *Ke 'l nostro amore ajungasi non voglio m' atalenti* ; Dino, III, 12, *Il re di Francia non volea si partisse di là*.



*Monge, di a Girart, gar, no li mence*; Cerc. 1, 10, *E quim diria m'en partis, Fariam morir des era*. (These Provençal sentences with *gardar*, "take care," seem to present an exact parallel to the Latin clauses with *cave, fac, facito*; cf. Plautus, *Most.* 854, *age canem istam a foribus aliquis abducat face*; *Rud.* 1219, *et tua filia facito oret*; *Capt.* 431, *cave tu mi iratus fias*.)<sup>1</sup>

c. With verbs of asking: *Aug.* 4, 22, *Per merceius prec, bella dousset' amia, Si cum yeus am, vos me vulhatz amar*; *Ba. Ch.* 245, 7, *E prec, si plaz, nom ochainon*; *Flam.* 5210, *E prega lus a bona fe La cossellhon*; *In. Par.* 4, 25, *E prec li nom mostr' erguelh No quart vas mi sa ricor*; *Gav.* 3, 61, *E prec merce m'ajatz*.<sup>2</sup>

3. Sentences containing an attraction of some part of the subjunctive sentences to the defining verb. The commonest form of this type contains a verb of willing with the negation, equivalent to the Latin *nolo amet*; *Ba. Ch.* 83, 21, *Autre jois no m'er dous ni bos, Ni non volh jam sia promes*; *ibid.*, 77, 2, *En baizan, nius plagues, Ja non volgram solses*; *ibid.*, 103, 9; 170, 15; *Born*, 2, 13, *E non vuolh sia mieus Doais Ses la sospisson de Cambrais*; *ibid.*, 33, 7; 33, 36; *Dan.* 3, 33, *No vueill s'assemble Mos cors ab autre amor*; *Rom.* 6, 20; *Flam.* 2954, 3506; *Alam.* 2, 38.

In the following sentences we find a more violent attraction, generally of the subject or object of the subjunctive sentence: *C. M.* 39, 3, *En Nicolet, d'un sognie qu'ieu sognava Meravillios, una nuit quan dormiva, Voil, m'esplanez*; *Flam.* 2905, *Non voil pas d'aital cavallier Moria per mi sil puesc' estorser*; *Born*, 13, 27, *Consellh vuolh dar el son de n'Alamanda Lai a'n Richart, sitot no lam demanda: Ja per son*

<sup>1</sup> For Italian, cf. *Monaci*, 46, 18, *Guarda non t'argolano questi forti corenti*.

<sup>2</sup> For Italian, cf. *Monaci*, 26, 3, 16, *Eo prego l'amore, a cui pregha ogni amante, Li miei sospiri e pianti Vi pungano lo core*.

*fraire sos homes non blanda* ; *ibid.*, 37, 60, *E prec a'n Golfier de la Tor Mos chantars nolh fassa paor* ;<sup>1</sup> Ap. Ch. 102, 15, *Mas sa gran merce prec, sil platz, la mi fass' apaguada* ; In. Par. 38, 10, *Dieu prec, non prenda dan tan grieu* ; Capd. 22, 68, *N' Audiartz, chascun dia prec dieu a rescos : Gart la comtess' e vos e midons na Maria.*

4. Sentences which show a shift of person, generally through being reported by another, and hence may be considered as partially subordinate in thought : Barra 5051, *Van contar Le respot del rey de la Serra E cum volia patz ses guerra E mosenhor G. tornes E son ric castel que cobres.* (Here with colloquial freedom a substantive, a *que*-clause and the paratactic subjunctive *tornes* are employed as exactly parallel constructions ; cf. the similar Latin sentence : Plautus, Amph. 9, *uti bonis uos uostrosque omnis nuntiis me adficere uoltis, ea adferam, ea uti nuntiem.*) ; Alam. 14, 40, *Per que mierz ama la dompna per un cen Que sos amanz vol muera honradamen D'armas, sin muor, que cil que ten en fre Lo seu, que vol viva aunitz per jase* ; Flam. 332, *E gardet si al plus que poc Noil fassa mal on que la toc* ; *ibid.*, 1065, 2013, 7091, 7120, 7789.

5. A special type of these paratactic jussive sentences in Provençal is constituted by expressions of fearing. It is now generally recognized that the Latin form *timeo ne veniat* consisted originally of an independent prohibition with a defining verb.<sup>2</sup> In Vulgar Latin the full negation *non* seems to have been substituted for *ne*, but otherwise the type remained unchanged.<sup>3</sup> Provençal examples which show the primitive relations without any shift are : Dan. 18, 12, *Tal*

<sup>1</sup> Here the attracted object is repeated by a personal pronoun in the subjunctive sentence.

<sup>2</sup> See Schmalz, § 211.

<sup>3</sup> Tobler has shown how out of this originally paratactic construction is to be explained the "expletive" *ne* in French *je crains qu'il ne vienne*.

*paor ai nol sia prop de l'arma*; Born 42, 37, *Dir non aus mon cor, Tal espaven mi pren de vos, Nous fezes desplazer*; In. Par. 155, 18, *Tal paor ay plazer nom cuelha Del sieu gen cors*; Ap. Ch. 1, 220, *E tem noil face torre la genitance*; Ba. Ch. 349, 29, *Per qe ai paor non prenas deisonor Per cesta gent avols e sens valor*.<sup>1</sup>

In case the original wish was affirmative, then the defining expression of fearing became negative, as in Gav. 6, 9, *Que ja per autre nos jungra Locx que non tem folhs deparca*. But the two original types, *tem non venha* and *non tem venha* were not kept rigidly distinct; only by contamination can we explain such sentences as the following: Capd. Un. 5, 37, *Eu nom pose d'una pessa mover Tal paor ai nom vailla chauzimens* (the original wish, if stated independently, must have been *mi vailla chauzimens*); Vaq. 1, 3, *Que paor ai tornes a mal estar A nos quels autres deuriar chastiar* (the original wish was *non torn a mal estar*); Flam. 6760, *E d'aisso era lui temensa Guillems vengues, e mal estera* (original wish: *non venga G.*); In. Par. 133, 45, *Don ai temor M'arma sia en tristor* (original wish: *m'arma non sia en tristor*).

Occasionally an originally potential subjunctive sentence contains an intercalated expression of fearing of a similar type. Such is, for example, In. Par. 65, 7, *Mas qui joven-sella Mi comandava bella Paor ai piuzella No fos al cap del an*. Here the subjunctive *no fos* is determined by the preceding protasis *qui comandava* (= *si om comandava*) and cannot be explained as a primitive wish-concept, but the defining verb of fearing is still purely parenthetic. The sentence is a good illustration of the impossibility of sharply distinguishing between the potential and the optative meanings inherent in the subjunctive form.

<sup>1</sup> For Italian, cf. Dante, canzone XII, 29, *Chè più mi trema il core, qualora io penso di lei in parte, ov' altri gli occhi induca, Per tema non traluca Lo mio pensier*; Dino, I, 19, *Sentendolo messer Niccola, ebbe paura non si palesasse più*.

D. In an independent sentence of fact, hypothesis or wish, an impersonal expression is inserted to define more exactly the idea of the principal verb. Type: *es obs venha*.

When such a definition is intercalated in an indicative sentence, the effect is the same as in the first form of defining parataxis already considered. The impersonal *mi par* has precisely the same force as *eu cre*; it defines the attitude of the speaker to the main utterance. So, for example: Crois. 8815, *Senh' en Br. bem sembra s'aisils avem giquitz, Vos meteis e nos autres avetz vius sebelhitz*; Sord. 17, 27, *En Andrieus, sitot s'aucis, Noi gazaingnet ren, som par*; Vid. 28, 21, *Mas car sui de celar ginhos, Degr' esser melhs mos pretz, som par*; Denkm. 249, 242, *E qui vai ad encontre e pueiss noss' en repent, Certz es, son plait perdra ses tot restaurament*; Flam. 3427, 3626; Ba. Ch. 161, 17.

In most cases, however, such impersonals are introduced into a subjunctive sentence, to define more closely the vague meaning of the persons of that mood. The subjunctive may be either potential, in which case an expression of seeming, *mi par*, *es vejaire*, *es vis*, is intercalated to strengthen the subjective character of the assertion: or optative, in which case an expression of necessity or fitness, *es obs*, *val mais*, *es dreitz*, *mi plai*, *mielhs es*, is introduced to elucidate the precise meaning of the mood. This construction was already prevalent in Latin; cf. for instance, Plautus, Asin. 448, *nunc adeam optimumst*; Poen. 1244, *pro hoc mihi patronus sim necesses*; and for Late Latin, Gregory of Tours, hist. franc. 4, 32, *Melius sibi fieri esset inter monachos occultus*; patr. 125, *contigit ad urbem Toroniam veniret*. Here, I may distinguish the following types:

1. With the impersonal inserted parenthetically into the subjunctive sentence: Born 35, 55, *Reis que badalh ni s'estenda, Quant au de batalha parlar, Sembla, o fassa per*

*vanejar O qu'en armas no s'entenda*; <sup>1</sup> Ba. Ch. 105, 21, *E pos si ficha ses somos, Semblail failla pans e maisos*; *Ibid.*, 389, 25; Ap. Ch. 38, 8, *Non o sai; mais l'entreseinha M'esmaia, con ques captanha D'una qu'aissim par m'estreignha Quel cor mi frainh' e m'estregna*; Sord. 40, 727, *Qui vol regnar ab sen verai, Obs l'es de conoisser si poign Totz jorns lo segle e s'en don soign*; In. Par. 75, 30, *Per que aisi com ieus am ses bauzia, es obs a mi segatz la semblan via.*<sup>2</sup>

2. With the impersonal prefixed or appended to the subjunctive sentence: Born 8, 6, *Semblais gardon d'anssessis*; *ibid.*, 12, 50, *A mon Mielhs-de-ben deman Son adreich, nou cors prezan, De que par a la veguda La fassa bon tener nuda*; Sord. 40, 258, *Bem pes, e par sia vertatz, Qu'el nasquet en desaventura*; Flam. 1818, *Ben fa parer l'aia trobat Solet quant tan fort lo combat*; *ibid.*, 2606, *Vejaire l'es tot lo mon aia E mai res noil posca falhir*; *ibid.*, 4598, 6339; Capd. Un. 3, 36, *E con val mais gardes genseis s'onor*; Denkm. 44, 1522, *Bem pot esser, cest angels fos Jhesus que n'es al cel pojatz*; Dan. 2, 25, *Dreiz es lagram Et arda e rim Qui 'ncontra amor janguoilla*; Capd. 1, 14, *Ar es sazoz facham son mandamen*; Gav. 1, 26, *Qual queus parletz, yeus dic eus man Que mielhs fora tug fossetz nug*; Daur. 351, *Un pauc fil ai, vuell vos merce clamar, Queus plassa, senhe, lo m'anes bategar*; Barra 2416, 3746; In. Par. 32, 16; 38, 30; 161, 18; 198, 39; <sup>3</sup> Ba. Ch. 180, 33; 202, 30; Born 24, 6; Ap. Ch. 110, 63; Crois. 2966. In Denkm. 142, 644, *Mas li valgra fos degolatz O fos son cors en foc crematz O que estes*

<sup>1</sup> Here the paratactic subjunctive sentence is correlative with a *que*-clause, as in other cases already considered.

<sup>2</sup> For Italian, cf. Guit., sonnet 24, 3, *La cosa ch'altrui par venen sia, È sola medecina al mio dolore*. Dino, II, 20, *Messer Carlo di Valos signore di grande e disordinata spesa, convenne palesasse la sua rea intenzione*.

<sup>3</sup> For Italian, cf. Guit., canzone II, 15, *Certo che ben è ragione Me sia noios' e spiacente*; Dante, sestina III, 10, *E sento doglia che par uom mi colli*.

*en cros penden*, we find the same correlation of a paratactic sentence and a *que*-clause already noted.

3. With the subjunctive sentence affected by the attractive influence of the impersonal. The attracted part is generally the simple negation, as in Ba. Ch. 105, 29, *E quis fai del autrui cortes, Pos del seu sera sobravars, Ges nom es vis aport razos C'a lui repairel guizerdos*; Sord. 7, 9, *Om que nuill temps non fetz colp ni pres plaja No m'es semblan pogues far nuill faich bon*; Zorzi 14, 36, *Pero dels tres nom par respos s'eschaja*; Rog., p. 92, 3, *No sembla sia coralz amicx*; S. Fe 259, *Ellal respon si que non ment*; *Ja deu non placza folz me tent*; Vid. 21, 41, *Pos nolh platz bes m'en eschaja, Peitz trai de mort*; Flam. 2047, *Non auri' obs m'o tradesses*; Capd. 12, 36, *Ja no m'agr' obs fos faitz lo miradors, On vos miratz vostre cors bel e gen*; Mont. 3, 24, *En tal sonalh An mes batalh Don non tanh pretz los vuelha*; Alv. 15, 20, *E non es obs, n'an delitz Per oltracujat vejaire*.

More rarely the subject or object of the subjunctive sentence is attracted to the impersonal, in the form of an adverbial modifier: Born 1, 16, *Mas d'aquest mon nom par aja sonh* (*mon* is the logical subject of *aja sonh*); *ibid.*, 31, 40, *E valgra mais, per la fe qu'ieu vos dei, Al rei Felip, comenses lo desrei Que plaidefar armatz sobre la glesa*; Sord. 40, 826, *Quar, segon la humanitat, D'ome cove, faza foldat*; Ba. Ch. 141, 1, *No s'eschai d'ome savai Li venga tan d'onors*.

E. To a potential sentence is prefixed a general denial, which negatives the possibility of the hypothesis posited in the main utterance. Type: *non es om non venha*. This form of sentence, which reappears in the early Teutonic dialects,<sup>1</sup> has been much discussed, and the various explanations proposed are by no means in accord. Diez<sup>2</sup> explained

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Otfried, 1, 17, 1, *Nist man nihein in uuorolt thaz saman al irsageti*; 1, 3, 21, *burg nist thes uuenke*.

<sup>2</sup> *Grammatik*, 1043.

the type as consisting of originally consecutive sentences with ellipse of the conjunction *que* and considered it as a parallel construction to the Latin *quin*-sentence (*nemo est quin non veniat*). This explanation is rejected by Meyer-Lübke<sup>1</sup> and Dubislav,<sup>2</sup> who see in such forms two paratactic independent sentences. They think that the first proposition is determined by the second and that the connection is so evidently emphasized by the negation that the speaker does not consider it necessary to indicate it by a single subordinating word like a relative. The Teutonic forms have been especially studied by L. Tobler<sup>3</sup> and Behagel,<sup>4</sup> who explain them as asyndetic parataxis. This solution is doubted by Delbrück,<sup>5</sup> who however proposes no other explanation in its stead. Paul<sup>6</sup> accepts the paratactic theory and suggests that such sentences need not necessarily be traced back to a common Indo-European form, but that they may have arisen spontaneously in later epochs.

It seems to me that the type *non es om non venha* cannot be separated from the other forms of defining parataxis already considered. It is most closely related to the type *non cre venha*. Just as in the latter the speaker defines his attitude to a hypothetical statement by the addition of a verb of mental action originally foreign to the thought, so here the mental attitude of the speaker is defined by the addition of a generalizing negation. The definition is there subjective, here objective. It seems furthermore likely that the type originated in question and answer. First a speaker made a hypothetical or repudiating question,<sup>7</sup> *om non venha*? To this the generalized negative answer *non es* was given. If now this dialogue be united into a single utterance and

<sup>1</sup> *Grammatik*, § 540.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>3</sup> *Germania*, xvii, 257 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Morris, *Subjunctive*, pp. 287-92.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, xxiv, 167 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Vergl. Syntax*, iii, 381-85.

<sup>6</sup> *Principien*<sup>2</sup>, 115.

the order of the parts be inverted, we get the perfect type already formulated.

I have considered as the normal type of this variety of defining parataxis the generalized negation of being. That is, the existence of the subject of the main hypothetical utterance is denied by the defining addition. The chief proposition, when it is made grammatically subordinate, becomes a relative clause. If, however, not the non-existence of a particular subject, but the non-performance of a particular act, be the afterthought of the speaker, we get generalized negative parataxes which, if subordinate, would become objective or subjective clauses. Thus I would explain, for example, sentences of the type *non pot esser non venha, non pose mudar non venha*. Here what is denied by the defining addition is merely the possibility of the hypothetical act posited in the main utterance.<sup>1</sup> Such sentences are less common in Provençal than the other type. I class here the following: Born 14, 66, *On venran tal cinc cent armat Que, quan serem tug ajustat, Non er, Peitieu no s'en planha*; *ibid.*, 23, 32, *E non pot esser remasut, Contra cel non volon tronco E que samit e cisclato E cendat noi sion romput*; Ba. Ch. 93, 15, *E pos tota res terrena S'alegra quan folha nais, Non pose mudar nom sovena D'un amor per qu'eu sui jais*; *ibid.*, 176, 28, *Quil fer en gauta, quil en col, El non pot mudar nos degol*; Ap. Ch. 1, 500, *Non laisserai per ren, par man non leu*; *ibid.*, 3, 437, *Totz m'atendretz mos covinenz, O ia, per dieu, aurs ni argens Nous garra, non siatz perduts*; Born 29, 1, *Non puosc mudar, un chantar non esparga*; Crois 3514, *Baro, ditz l'apostolis, no pos mudar, nom pes, Car ergolhs e maleza es entre nos ases*; Alv. 7, 15, *E pero non puese mudar, De mos enemics nol gar*; Flam. 4550,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the common Old French "cheville," *ne poet muer n'en plurt*, *Roland*, 826.



*Margarida nos pot tener, Non dig' un pauc de som plazer ;*  
*Dicht. 11, 2, Bona domna, tan vos ai fin coratge, Non puese*  
*mudar, nous cosselh vostre be ; Capd. 20, 29, Eu non ai poder,*  
*rompa ni franha L'amor qu'ieu l'ai.*

Returning now to the more usual type, *non es om non venha*, there remain to be considered the various modifications of this primitive form brought about in the development of the language. As already stated, it is generally the subject of the subjunctive sentence which is defined by the preceding negation ; but two cases at least are found in which the defining negation affects the object of the main utterance :<sup>1</sup> Ap. Ch. 85, 43, *Ni anc no fo res meinz prezes Daitals joglars esbahuiz ;* Flam. 4340, *Res non es amors non ensein.* In Born, 43, 8, *Aissi cum un confraire, No i es uns nol poscatz tondr' e raire*, the object-concept is carried forward by a personal pronoun in the subjunctive sentence.

In all other cases, however, the "missing relative," to use a convenient expression, is subject : Ap. Ch. 6, 112, *Que se el l'acosego, la perda er tamanha, Tro a Maroc lo gran non er selh no s'en planha ;* *ibid.*, 96, 17, *Mas non es hom en tot lo mon pietz traya Com selh cuy ditz quascus : "paya me, paya ;"* Flam. 376, *Ni de Baiona ni de Blaya Non fon pros hom letras non aia ;* *ibid.*, 1427, *E non es cavalliers ni clergues Adonc pogues ab leis parlar ;* *ibid.*, 1768, *Non fon res el mon tan grius, A leis non paregues trop leus ;*<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, 5980, 7777 ; In. It. 26, 625, *Car non es nuills destrics Ni messions, no i tagna ;* In. Par. 67, 11, *Uey non es Nulhs om pogues la falseza Que a en si ;* *ibid.*, 181, 24, *Car entre totz los corals amadors Non fo us miels ames ses falsura Con ai amat.*<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Similar constructions are of doubtful recurrence in Old French ; cf. Dubislav, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> This sentence may be considered as a contamination of two types of parataxis, the contrasted and the defining.

<sup>3</sup> For Italian, cf. Guit., sonnet 33, 8, *Omo non è già sì fermo 'n sua fede, non fallisse, an' eo ver vostro amore ;* *ibid.*, canzone 13, 13, *Altro non è sì ben cominci e sovri En tutto ciò dove donna altra s'ovri.*

When this type was fully established, it was inevitable that shiftings and attractions should occur, tending to develop a closer union between the two elements. Even in the sentences already considered, it may be questioned whether the subjects *om*, *res*, etc., do not belong really to both sentences, according to the construction called *απὸ κοινοῦ*. In all other varieties of this type, this *απὸ κοινοῦ* is more apparent; the subject is attracted out of the main subjunctive utterance and associated with the defining negative. The simplest kind of attraction is seen in such examples as Cerc. 1, 17, *Anc res no fo no s'umelis Vas amor, mas ill n'es fera*; In. Par. 113, 22, *Anc hom mais pres no fo, No volgues esser desliuratz*. That however even in this case Provençal did not regard the subjunctive sentence as subordinate is shown by such a passage as In. Par. 194, 27, *Quar anc princeps negus melher no fo El nostre temps de sa ni de la mar, Ni tant aya fach sobre la gent canha*, in which it is introduced by the coördinating conjunction.

The next step toward subordination was taken when for the general negative *non es* another negative verb was substituted, with which the subject of the subjunctive sentence was associated. The original condition with such verbs is shown by such an example as Dan. 14, 25, *Non sai hom tan sia e dieu frems, Ermita ni monge ni clerc, Cum ieu vas cella de cui can*, in which the attraction has not yet taken place.<sup>1</sup> This example proves also the close connection which once existed between "relative" sentences of this type and those discussed under type C. Canello translates: "*non conosco alcuno che sia tanto devoto a Dio*;" but a translation: "*non so che alcuno sia tanto devoto*" is equally possible.

Ordinarily, however, the subject of the main utterance

<sup>1</sup> That *om* is here the late analogical accusative form is unlikely. Arnaut Daniel keeps faithfully to the old declension *om—ome*; cf. 14, 17 and 17, 29.

becomes the subject or object of the defining negative verb. The chief varieties of this attraction are :

a. The subject of the subjunctive sentence is object of impersonal *non a* : Ba. Ch. 32, 14, *Non i a negu de vos jam desautrei* ; *ibid.*, 371, 30, *Non ac negun non menes gran dolor* ; Ap. Ch. 5, 447, *Anc non ac en la cort baro, Cavalier donsel ni donzela, Sesto ni sest, ni sel ni sela, De las novas nos azautes E per bonas non las lauzes* ; Brun. 1, 3, *E no y a ram no s'entressenh* ; Born. 34, 45, *Noi aura un no veja son arnes* ; Dan. 17, 30, *El mon non ha home de negun nom Tant desires gran benenansa aver Cum ieu fatz lieis* ; *ibid.* 18, 10 ; Crois. 429, 1233, 5205, 7366 ; Flam. 533 ; Denkm. 80, 2656 ; 157, 12.

b. The subject of the subjunctive sentence is object of a transitive verb : Ap. Ch. 1, 18, *Non laisse aver en Fransa bon car ne leu, Ni rente en sa anor, cenz ne tonleu, Tot nos face venir aici o seu* ; *ibid.* 6, 45, *Anc no vi fautz en bratz ni falco montargi Tant be cas per usatie ni segua la perdris* ; *ibid.* 22, 19, *Ni anc Bordeus Non ac seignor tant fos gail-lartz Cum ieu* ; *ibid.* 105, 178, (Boeci), *Anc no vist omne ta grant onor agues, Sil forfez tan dont ellas rancures, Sos corps ni s'anma miga per ren guaris* ; Born. 17, 3, *Pero non hai ni senhor ni vezi, D'aquest afar aja cor ni talan Ni vuelha ges qu'en chantan lo casti* ; Dan. 2, 51, *Anc no vim Del temps Caim Amador meins acuoilla Cor trichador* ; Crois. 288, *Anc dieus no fe nulh clerc per punha que i mezes, Los pogues totz escriure e dos mes o en tres* ; *ibid.* 3365, *E no as en ta cort cardenal ni abat Agues millor crezensa e la crestiandat* ; Monk 4, 26, *Anc mais no fi ardit tan bem vengues* ; Vid. 12, 33, *Anc no vist nulh arquier Tan dreg ni tan prim traisses* ; Flam. 143, 1150, 1193 ; Dicht. 2, 2, 26.

In a few sentences of this type the defining negation is not actually expressed, but implied by *pauc* or a similar word : In. Par. 33, 22, *Si duerm trop, non er quim revelh,*

*Ans si penran tug a gabar ; E s'istau tot jorn al solelh, Pauc trobarai m'an covidar ;* Flam. 1193, *Ben pauc ne sai gelos non fossan.*

c. The subject of the subjunctive sentence is subject of the defining verb : Alv. 9, 44, *Anc om no nasquet de maire, Tan beus posca valer ;* Rom. 13, 71, *Eu non cre que negus fo naz Con tan bel glavi fos navraz ;* Flam. 2000, *Ja nuls om non s'avenra Tan destreitz non garisqu' els bainz ;* Denkm. 225, 355, *Vergena de las verges, francha res e grazida, C'anc no nasquet de carn d'aquesta nostra vida Nulha fila de femna tan ben fos establida.*

Whether out of this type sentences could be formed which seem to show a relative-locative relation, as in Zorzi 14, 31, *Anc no preiron Venecian conten Non aguesson lauzer al fenimen : Sirv. Jog. 12, 10, Anc un bon mot non fezes Non i agues dos malvas*,<sup>1</sup> is doubtful. I prefer to regard these sentences as exhibiting parataxis by contrast ; the subjunctive sentence is conditional in character.<sup>2</sup>

Dubislav<sup>3</sup> has shown that in this negative defining parataxis, in Old French, the indicative may occasionally be used (*ni a celui ne se clame chaitis*). The difference in mood depends of course on the subjective attitude of the speaker ; if he think that the proposition which he defines by negation is valid in point of fact, the indicative is naturally chosen. In Provençal the use of the indicative is also probable, but the only example of this form which I have found occurs in "Daurel et Beton," a poem whose language is too mixed to permit a definite conclusion : Daur. 645, *Tuh la regardo li*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Ba. Ch. 167, 12, where the relation is still more complicated.

<sup>2</sup> For Old French, see Dubislav, 25. In Italian, however, we find sentences of this locative character which present the pure type of defining parataxis ; cf. Guit., canzone 16, 52, *Nel mondo non è loco no canto, No li portasse pietanza e doglia.*

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

*gran e li menor, Non i a un nois plore de dolor.* In Ba. Ch. 182, 18, *Pero si negun n'i a Mais ne saubes e meills dizia Ja nos pense que m'enoges*, the indicative *dizia* is correlated with a subjunctive, *saubes*; but is evidently employed for the sake of the rhyme.

F. In an utterance of fact, an independent sentence is intercalated to indicate a time-relation of the main thought. Type: *ieu vinc un an a*. The relations here are so simple and this type of parataxis is so well known, being still preserved in most of the Romance languages that I shall content myself with a citation of the principal examples. The verbs used in the defining sentence in Provençal are impersonal *aver*, *esser* and *passar*; Ap. Ch. 3, 136, *E fora bellazor dos tans, Mas non fo, prop a de set ans*; *ibid.*, 84, 23; Born 28, 4, *Assaut ni cembel Nom vin, mais aura d'un an*; Crois. 3633, *Aicels de Savardu lor tolol vin e pan, E no vendemieren, so cug, mais a d'un an*; Gav. 4, 30, *Lonc temps a degra remaner La foldatz que vos mantenetz*; Barra, 4953, *Mosenh' en G. aytals es Cum era huey a XIII ans*; Born 4, 14, *Eu fora lai, ben ha passat un an*; Barra 4761, *Que lunhas novas non ausem, Ni fem, ben a passatz XX ans*; Biog. 13, *Lo joglars demandet an Arnaut si avia fag, en Arnautz respos que oc, passat a III jorns*; Gesta 837, *Alcus reys e princeps, que avia faitz jurar, pessa avia*; *ibid.*, 1428, 1846; In. Par. 13, 24, *Mas, pel senhor qu'en crotz fo mes, Sa colors fresqu' e vermeilla Camja mon sen, tal ora es*. Such time-definitions go back undoubtedly to Vulgar Latin speech-forms. Sentences not very dissimilar appear occasionally in the classical authors; cf. Cicero, ad Att. 2, 15, 3, *nondum plane ingemueram: salve, dixit Arrius*.

The preceding pages illustrate the remarkable abundance of the paratactic type of sentence structure in Provençal. It will be seen that nearly every relation ordinarily expressed by means of subordinating conjunctions and pronouns may

also be indicated by parataxis. Provençal in this respect evidently remains in the earlier stage of a literary language struggling to free itself from the primitive method of stringing concepts together without unity. Nevertheless the fondness of the language for parataxis must not be overestimated. Beside every form of sentence-structure with parataxis there existed another form with hypotaxis and the latter are numerically the more important. To illustrate this difference, I shall take that typical troubadour of the golden age, Bertran de Born. A count of the first twenty *cansos* of Stimming's edition shows that Bertran employed parataxis to indicate a relation of concepts in about 16 % of all the sentences which clearly are subordinate in thought. In all remaining instances, he employs a subordinating word, conjunction or pronoun.

Vossler<sup>1</sup> has lately pointed out that languages used by races in lower stages of culture prefer the paratactic type of sentence structure, those more advanced the hypotactic. Vossler uses the term parataxis in a more extended sense than I have done, but even restricting it in accordance with the definition given above, a comparison of Provençal with Old French on one hand and Early Italian on the other proves the justice of his general principle. Notwithstanding the diversity of the paratactic types in Provençal, a glance at Dubislav's program<sup>2</sup> shows that in Old French the variety is still greater. And that in numerical frequency Provençal is also inferior may be proved by a comparison of two works of like literary character, such as *Orson de Beauvais* and the *Chanson de la Croisade contre les Albigeois*. In the 3,600 lines of the former I have counted 95 unmistakable cases of "subordinating" parataxis, while a like number of lines in the latter contained only 60. In Italian

<sup>1</sup> *Sprache als Schöpfung und Entwicklung*, p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> For Old French forms lacking in Provençal, see Dubislav, p. 7, 9.

on the other hand parataxis is comparatively rare, much rarer than in Provençal.<sup>1</sup> The significance of these results from Vossler's "cultur-historisch" standpoint cannot be mistaken.

In the Old Provençal language itself a progressive tendency toward hypotaxis is quite evident. The best proof of this is afforded by a comparison of the two romans d'aventure, *Flamenca*, written probably about 1234,<sup>2</sup> and *Guillaume de la Barre*, dated 1318. The former contains, in 5,300 lines, 94 examples of parataxis, while the latter has only 32. The difference is striking, and proves the existence of a real progress in the language.

Another noteworthy fact is the relative scarcity of parataxis in prose literature. In those prose monuments which are mere translations of Latin originals, this is not surprising, but it is equally manifest in the Biographies of the Troubadours. The same fact, however, is noticeable in Old French. Villehardouin,<sup>3</sup> for instance, contains only three examples of defining parataxis. The explanation must, I think, be sought partly in the subservience of the prose authors to existing Latin models, and partly in their more deliberate habit of thought, so different from the emotional energy and rapidity of the lyric poets.

WILLIAM PIERCE SHEPARD.

<sup>1</sup> Except with Dino Compagni, whose short-hand style is evidently peculiar to himself.

<sup>2</sup> See Revillout, *Revue des langues romanes*, VIII, pp. 5-18.

<sup>3</sup> See Greving, *Studien über die Nebensätze bei Villehardouin*, Kiel, 1903.

## LIST OF TEXTS CITED, WITH ABBREVIATIONS.

- Ap. Ch. : Appel, *Provenzalische Chrestomathie*, Leipzig, 1895.  
 Ba. Ch. : Bartsch, *Chrestomathie provençale*, 5<sup>e</sup> éd., Berlin, 1892.  
 C. M. : Crescini, *Manualetto provençale*, Verona, 1892.  
 Denkm. : Suchier, *Denkmäler provenzalischer Literatur und Sprache*, Halle, 1883.  
 In. Par. : Appel, *Provenzalische Inedita aus Pariser Handschriften*, Leipzig, 1890.  
 In. It. : Appel, *Poésies inédites tirées des manuscrits d'Italie*, Paris, 1898.  
 Dicht. : Schultz, *Die provenzalischen Dichterinnen*, Leipzig, 1888.  
 Sirv. Jog. : Withoef, *Sirventes joglaresc*, Marburg, 1891.  
 Alam. : Salverda de Grave, *Le Troubadour Bertran d'Alamanon*, Toulouse, 1902.  
 Alv. : Zenker, *Die Lieder Peires von Auvergne*, Erlangen, 1900.  
 Aug. : Müller, *Die Gedichte des Guillem Augier Novella*, Zs. f. rom. Phil., xxiii, 47-78.  
 Barra : P. Meyer, *Guillaume de la Barre, par Arnaut Vidal de Castelnau d'Arri*, Paris, 1895 (Soc. des anc. textes fr.).  
 Biog. : Chabaneau, *Les Biographies des troubadours en langue provençale*, Toulouse, 1885.  
 Blac. : Soltan, *Die Werke des Trobadors Blacatz*, Zs. f. rom. Phil., xxiii, 201-248.  
 Born : Stimming, *Bertran de Born, sein Leben und seine Werke*, Halle, 1879.  
 Bornelh : Kolsen, *Guiraut von Bornelh, der Meister der Trobadors*, Berlin, 1894.  
 Brun. : Appel, *Der Trobador Uc Brunec*, in *Tobler-Abhandlungen*, Halle, 1895, pp. 44-78.  
 Capd. : Napolski, *Leben und Werke des Trobadors Ponz de Capduoill*, Halle, 1880.  
 Cerc. : Dejeanne, *Le Troubadour Cercamon*, Toulouse, 1905.  
 Crois. : P. Meyer, *La Chanson de la croisade contre les Albigeois*, Paris, 1875 (Soc. de l'hist. de France).  
 Dan. : Canello, *La vita e le opere del trovatore Arnaldo Daniello*, Halle, 1883.  
 Daur. : P. Meyer, *Daurel et Beton, chanson de geste provençale*, Paris, 1880 (Soc. des anc. textes fr.).  
 S. Fe : J. Leite de Vasconcellos, *Cancão de Sancta Fides de Agen*, Romania, xxxi, 177-200.  
 Flam. : P. Meyer, *Le Roman de Flamenca*, 1<sup>e</sup> éd., Paris, 1865.  
 Gav. : Jeanroy, *Poésies du troubadour Gavaudan*, Romania, xxxiv, 498-539.  
 Gesta : Schneegans, *Gesta Karoli Magni ad Carcassonam et Narbonam*, Halle, 1898 (Rom. Bibl. xv).  
 Monk : Philippson, *Der Mönch von Montaudon*, Halle, 1873.



- Mont. : Coulet, *Le Troubadour Guillem Montanhagol*, Toulouse, 1898.  
Rog. : Appel, *Das Leben und die Lieder des Trobadors Peire Rogier*, Berlin, 1882.  
Rom. : Zenker, *Die Gedichte des Folquet von Romans*, Halle, 1896 (Rom. Bibl. xii.)  
Rud. : Stimming, *Der Troubadour Jaufre Rudel, sein Leben und seine Werke*, Halle, 1873.  
Sord. : de Lollis, *Vita e Poesie di Sordello di Goito*, Halle, 1896 (Rom. Bibl. xi).  
Vaq. : Schultz, *Die Briefe des Trobadors Raimbaut de Vaqueiras an Bonifaz I*, Halle, 1893.  
Vid. : Bartsch, *Peire Vidals Lieder*, Berlin, 1857.  
Zorzi : Levy, *Der Troubadour Bertolome Zorzi*, Halle, 1883.

Ba. Ch., Denkm., In. Par., In. It., Biog. are cited by page and line, all the others by number of piece and line.

The abbreviation Un. signifies that the citation is to be found among the "unechte Lieder," included in the respective editions of the troubadour cited.